F.14.28

AN ENDEAVOUR TO RECTIFIE SOME *PREVAILING OPINIONS*, Contrary to the Doctrine of The Church of England.

By the Author of *The Great Propitiation*; And, *A Discourse of Natural and Moral-Impotency.*

BIBL. CANT. CICC.

LONDON,
Printed by T. M. for Robert Clavel, in *Cross-Keys* Court, in *Little-Brittain*. 1671.



672:03

THE
Author to the Reader.

I *Publiſhed about two Years ſince, ſome Sermons called,* The Great Propitiation; *and thereto Added a ſhort Diſcourſe concerning the Apoſtle* Paul's *meaning by* Juſtification by Faith, without Works. *About half a Year after, there came forth a Learned Book, called,* Harmonia Apoſtolica, *written by Mr.* George Bull, *which quite croſſing the Interpretation I had given of Saint* Paul, *I was Occaſioned by ſome Occurrences, which it concerns not the Reader to know, to Write the ſubſtance of theſe Reflections upon it, which were Written within leſs than three Months after it's coming forth, without any Deſign of Printing them. And ſince I had Written this, there is Publiſhed a Diſcourſe of Mr.* Charles Gataker (Thomæ τῦ μακαρίτε Filii) *wherein he ſignifying his diſlike of Mr.* Bull's, *Propounds a third way to Reconcile the Apoſtles,* Paul, *and* James. *What my thoughts are of Mr.* Bull's *way, you will here ſee. I think he hath in the main, ſpoken right concerning the ſenſe of Saint* James;

But I think Mr. Gataker, *hath given the right Interpretation of neither, and judg that I have ſaid enough in my Book fore-mentioned, to make it appear, and ſo hath Mr.* Bull *in his.*

I grant, and lament it, that many Important Doctrines of the Reformed Churches, *are frequently by too many groſly Explained, ſo as to have ill Conſequences following from them; which if rightly Explained, would be found not to Patronize, but to diſown ſuch Conſequences. And hence many Learned men, ſeeing the Intolerableneſs of ſuch conſequent Opinions, and not being able to Extricate themſelves, deny Important truths, and maintain ſuch Opinions as theſe following (which are the Foundation of the greateſt part of Mr.* Bull's *Book oppoſed, and would make an intolerable change in the very ſubſtance of the Body of Divinity) viz.* "Firſt, *That there is no Law that threatens Fu-* "*ture-death, or promiſed Future-happineſs,* "*but the Goſpel or Law of Grace.* Secondly, "*That the Jewiſh Law, or Law of* Moſes, *had* "*only Temporal Promiſes and Threats, and re-* "*quired only External Obedience. (Which yet, you will ſee, I grant in one Limitted ſenſe of it, to be true.)* "Thirdly, *That no Law of God* "*whatſoever requires perfect Obedience, and ſo* "*no man is bound to live perfectly, or free from* "*ſin.*

"*ſin.* Fourthly, *And that for this Reaſon,* "*becauſe no man is bound to do what he cannot* "*do.* (*Which Reaſon is only true in a ſenſe, nothing to the purpoſe; but it is dangerouſly falſe, to deny a man is bound to do what he cannot do, in another ſenſe,* viz. *Upon the account of his Morally inſuperable wickedneſs, as I have elſe-where at large ſhewed.*) "Fifthly, "*That, for any Evidence we have from Scrip-* "*ture to the contrary, men after Converſion,* "*or after the receiving of the Goſpel, do live* "*perfectly or without ſin, or do as much as any* "*Law of God requires from them.* Sixthly, "*That the effect of the Grace of the Spirit is* "*ſomething, that if denied to men enjoying the* "*Goſpel, they would be excuſable or blameleſs,* "*in not obeying the Goſpel.*

Alſo, Theſe following Expoſitions, would alter the very ſubſtance of the ſenſe of moſt Important parts of Scripture. "Firſt, *That the A-* "*poſtle* Paul, *doth not diſpute againſt Juſtifi-* "*cation by perfect Obedience to the Law, as be-* "*ing impoſſible to man in this Life.* Secondly, "*That our Lord in the* 5th. *of* Matthew, *doth* "*not vindicate the Law from corrupt Interpre-* "*tations, but adds to it, making that the mean-* "*ing of it, that never was ſo before.* (*Take notice, I charge not this laſt mentioned Expoſi-*

tion,

tion, as maintained by Mr. Bull, *though it be by many others; and though it must follow by consequence, if what he maintains be true,* viz. *That* Moses's *Law had no Internal Precepts.)*

I judg, what I have here written, may be of use for the clearing of those in Dispute, and many other passages of Scripture, and for the Confutation of many dangerous Opinions, or I should not have permitted it's Publication. I shall not here needlesly use Protestations concerning my Fidelity, in representing, by a Translation, Mr. Bull's *Discourse, since it is commonly accounted a sign of Guilt, to cleer one's self before accused. If any should suspect me of Disingenuity herein, let me desire them to read the passages here replyed to, out of Mr.* Bull's *Book it self. And to encourage (so far as my word will pass) them that have it not, to procure it; I shall say, that much of it is well worth Reading; and that I am far from passing that censure on the rest of the Book, which I do on the parts here replied to. May but what is here written be so read and considered, without prejudice and passion (which may well be expected from ingenuous Lovers of Truth) that it may have free Influence upon mens understandings according to the evidence it brings: I shall not much doubt of it's good success, in composing many differences in Opinion; Which is the Prayer of the Author.*

ER-

ERRATA.

PAge 27. *Line* 17. *Read* ſo ſpeak, *Marg.* *r.* Heavenly. *p.* 34. *l.* 16. after here, *r.* in. *p.* 67. *l.* 23. inſtead of alſo, *r* at *Sinai*. *p.* 75. *l.* 17. after ſatuus, *r.* of a new Covenant. *p.* 90. *l.* 5. for was, *r.* as. *l.* 6. *r.* on us, *p.* 108. *l.* 25. after ask, *r.* as I would ask. *p.* 125. *l.* 20. for Arguments, *r.* Argument. *p.* 168. *l.* penult, *r.* exiguum. *p.* 171. *l.* marg; 20. *r.* Adulterio. *p.* 208. *l.* 15 for to, *r.* do.

An endeavour to Rectifie some prevailing Opinions.

THE Learned Author's design is very commendable, *viz.* To reconcile such seemingly contrary Expressions of the Apostle *Paul*, and *James*, as these [You see therefore that a man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only, *Jam.* 2.24. We conclude therefore that a man is justified by Faith, without the works of the Law, *Rom.*3.28.] which Scriptures he sets down before his discourse, as the Chief, or Examplars of the chief Places he designs to reconcile.

He divides his whole Discourse into two Dissertations; The first whereof is about the meaning of the Apostle *James* in such Expressions as that cited, and is so short as not to take up a fifth part of the Book; The second about the sense of the Apostle *Paul* in his seemingly contrary Affirmations, taking up all the rest of the Book.

His whole first Dissertation concerning the sense of the Apostle *James*, in affirming Justification by Works as a condition, is Acute, Solid, and Cogent; yea, and so is all generally in his second Dissertation to the *5th.* Chap. and part of it; he spending those Chapters in discovering the weakness and falsehood of the attempts of many designing to reconcile such places, and in proving the Apostle *Paul*, means not one single virtue by Faith, but the whole Gospel-condition, the whole duty required for Salvation, or the obedience of Faith. And I judg thus much of it (which is near one third part of the Book) highly worth the Reading of any that have any other apprehensions of the meaning of *James*, or that are not satisfied that the Apostle *Paul* by Faith, means the whole necessary duty of a Christian.

* *Quantum mutatus ab illo.*

Hectore qui redit exuvias indutus Achillis.

But * now when he begins at the *6th.* Chapter of the second Dissertation, to tell positively what the Apostle *Paul* means by excluding Works of the Law from Justification, and what he means by Works, and by the Law; The sense he

he fastens on the Apostle is quite remote from his meaning, and would not only make the whole discourse of the Apostle, about denying Justification by works, a vain useless Speculation; but also would bring in such intolerable Opinions as these following, at least by evident consequence, *viz.*

First, That no man sins while he lives a truly Christian life, sincerely obedient to the Law; and so needeth no pardon, or Christ's satisfaction for such failings as are consistent with true Christianity.

Secondly, That there is no such thing as pardon of sin possible as to Eternal punishment, or punishmeut after this Life; neither did Christ satisfie for the breach of any Law as to any Eternal punishment, or punishment after this Life, but onely for Temporal. Not that I affirm that the Author holds this Opinion (for it is apparent he holds the contrary) but this follows by undeniable consequence from his discourse, though he see it not, but will deny this consequence.

Thirdly, That there is no possible

Argument againſt Popiſh perfection or meriting, ſo far as to need no pardon, from thoſe paſſages in *Pauls* Epiſtles, that deny Juſtification by Works; but meerly ſuch a vain uſeleſs Speculation as this, That good Works done without knowledg of, or reſpect to a future recompence of reward, do not merit; and works done by one that hath in no ſenſe any ability to do them, do not merit.

Theſe four things following ſeem apparently to be the πρῶτα ψεύδη, the firſt great Miſtakes; and the occaſion of all his * other miſtakes of the Apoſtle *Pauls* ſenſe, in denying Juſtification by Works.

* Yea, theſe alſo ſeem to be the cauſes of the miſtakes of many other very learned Authors, much of his Judgment, in the particulars, here endeavoured to be Rectified.

1. His denying, that there is any ſuch thing, as any Law of God (ſetting the Goſpel it ſelf aſide) made with Mankind to this Tenour or Purport: That he that doth not every thing that God requires of him whatſoever, whether by the Light of Nature, or the Writings

tings of the Old and New Teſtament, ſhall be ſubject to Eternal miſery, or miſery after *this* Life; and if men do all that God requires of them, by any way making *his* will known, they ſhall be eternally Happy, or Happy after this Life; but he thinks, There is no Law of God that threatens future miſery, or promiſes future happineſs, but only the Goſpel it ſelf, which is reveaed in the Old and New Teſtament: And that any Law threatning future miſery (I mean after this Life) or promiſing future Happineſs, is the Goſpel it ſelf, whereby men alwayes were and are juſtified and ſaved.

Now to prove againſt this, and that we muſt hold a Law threatning future and Eternal miſery to all ſinners, and that all are condemned and none juſtified by this Law, and that this Law is diſtinct and quite different from the Goſpel, let theſe things be conſidered.

1. If there be no Law diſtinct from the Goſpel, threatning future miſery, or miſery after this Life, then Chriſt never ſatisfied for the future miſery that was threatned to any; never died to

free any from the wrath to come; from the eternal or future Curſe of any ſuch Law; but only from a temporal Curſe, or Curſe of this Life. The conſequence is apparent, becauſe he knows not what he ſays, that ſhould affirm, that Chriſt was made under the Goſpel, to free us from the Curſe of the Goſpel; for the Goſpel either threatens nothing (as many hold, but I judg them to err) or, which is apparent, it threatens nothing except to them that perform not its condition, *viz.* To them that Believe not, and Repent not in this Life, and it is certain Chriſt died not to Redeem finally-Impenitent Unbelievers.

Chriſt's Satisfaction was made to the Law, and not to the Goſpel: to free them that perform not the condition of the Law, *viz.* perfect Obedience; but not to free them that perform not the condition of the Goſpel. There was indeed a ſatisfaction made to the Law, that God might with Juſtice and Honour, with ſafety to the Law make this Act of Oblivion, this Law, of Grace, the Goſpel: Therefore ſurely that firſt

Ori-

Original-Law did threaten eternal death to ſinners, and not meerly Temporal puniſhment, elſe there cannot poſſibly be any ſatisfaction for ſin, as to Eternal puniſhment at all, becauſe the firſt Law to which the ſatisfaction was made, did not threaten it. Suppoſe a Law in force that every Felon ſhall be ſold to work in the Galleys, and the King's Son paid a great price, and, by this, obtained of the King this conditional Act of Oblivion to be made, that if ſuch Offenders will ſerve his Son in the Wars, they ſhould be Acquitted, but if they ſhrink from ſuch Service, they ſhall die. Here indeed was a price paid to free them from being Gally-ſlaves, but none paid to free them from Death; becauſe the firſt Original Law that was tranſgreſſed by their Felony did not threaten Death, but only Slavery. And you cannot ſay, that the price was paid to free them from the Penalty of the Law of Grace, or Act of Oblivion, which doth threaten Death, but the ſatisfaction was made to the firſt Law only; though indeed the Act of Oblivion or Remedying Law, was made upon the account of the price

paid in ſatisfaction for the breach of the firſt Law.

2. If there be no Law threatning wrath to come, or future miſery but only the Goſpel it ſelf, then no man can be pardoned, or can need pardon by the Goſpel, or the Bloud of Chriſt as to the wrath to come; for the Goſpel affords no pardon to its tranſgreſſors, that is, to men continuing to death in Impenitency and Unbelief. The Goſpel indeed affords pardon to transgreſſors of the Law; yea, and to transgreſſors of the Commands of the New Teſtament, ſo far as they are tranſgreſſions of the Law (and threatned by that general Law, Curſed is he that doth not all, any way revealed to be his duty) provided they perform the Goſpel-conditions; but the Goſpel affords no pardon at all to them that fall under its curſe, by not performing the Goſpel-condition. Suppoſe a Law made threatning every Felon with Death, and ſuppoſe a conditional Act of Oblivion, or Remedying Law made, that if the Felon read, he ſhall not die; the pardon is only as to the firſt Law and Breach of it; for there

is

is no pardon as to this second Law, and Breach of it; for if he do not read, which is the condition of the second Law, there is no pardon for his failing therein. So that if the first Law never threatned Eternal death, there can be no pardon as to Eternal death.

And which maketh it still apparent, is this: Pardon must be by some Law, (else it may be Forbearance, or Reprieve, but no Pardon) and no Law can possibly in any case whatsoever, afford pardon of Offences against it self; it is a contradiction to say it may. For, (to answer an objection that may be in your mind) suppose a Law made, threatning the Offenders only conditionally; as threatning death except a man abjure the Realm, or pay a sum of Money; in this case if the person either abjure or pay the Money, here is no pardoning any thing the Law threatned, for the Law never threatned his death absolutely. So that you see there cannot possibly be pardon of a transgression from the Law it self, but only from another Law, a Remedying Law, or Act of Oblivion. Therefore the Gospel which is an Act of Pardon, or Oblivi-

on

on for those that are guilty of the breach of another Law, cannot possibly pardon an offence against it self, which is failing in the performing the condition of it, by dying in Unbelief: For any that will affirm pardon in the failing in the condition of this Act of Oblivion, he must affirm some new Law made (for a Remedying Law to one cast by the Gospel) to this effect, That if men die impenitent they shall be saved, provided they or others for them, perform the condition while they are in an other world, which the *Papists* affirm something a kin to. Now if the Gospel afford no pardon to them that perform not its condition, as it is impossible it should, and no Law else threatens Eternal death, there cannot possibly be any pardon of sin as to Eternal death. So that you see, whatsoever this Author saith to the contrary, we must hold a Law threatning Eternal death, or Wrath to come, (which Christ hath undergone a punishment for the satisfaction of) distinct from the Gospel, or the Law of Grace, that was founded upon the account of this satisfaction; and that all are condemned

demned by this Law; and that as to Future and Eternal concernments; and that none are Justified by it: Which if the Author had considered, he would surely have told us better than he hath done, what the Apostle meant by the Law, and works of the Law, which he denies Justification by.

Yea, and you must hold, that this Law threatning wrath to come to every Offender is yet in force, and not Abrogated by the Gospel; yea, and that it threatens men that do perform the Gospel-condition as really as others. I shall not deny that such a Law seiseth upon mens being sinners, as to the Promissary part (as a promise made to a man if he shall work all such a week, doth cease after he hath failed the first day) but it is actually in Force still with its penalty requiring perfect Obedience, and not only sincere; which I thus prove.

First, Else we must say, that no man sins or transgresseth this Law, so he do but perform the Gospel condition, so he be but in the main a sincere Christian; and consequently that no sincere Christian needs Christs satisfaction or par-

don

don for ſuch ſins as are conſiſtent with Goſpel ſincerity; which is an Opinion which I almoſt dread to mention, though the Author ſeems very confident in it, for he maintains, *pag.* 108.112. That, ſo men do but chiefly mind the beſt things, do but obſerve the main Precepts of the Law, no Law whatſoever requires any more of them; and alſo holds, that men after * Converſion, or receiving the Goſpel, for any diſability on them to the contrary, may, and for any evidence we have in the Scripture to the contrary, do, live ſuch lives as not to ſin any ſin that deſerves, or is by any Law threatned ſo much as conditionally with Eternal death (and ſo it follows conſequently, as any one ſees, that they need no pardon, or the Blood of Chriſt for ſuch ſins as to Eternal puniſhment) though yet he grants (but yet, any one may ſee, with ſome reluctancy) That *pag.* 117. All do ſometime or other of their lives commit ſome either ſin, or ſins, that deſerves Eternal puniſhment, and con-

* I cannot tell whether he mean after Converſion, or after the meer Preaching of the Goſpel to them; but however I will conſtrue it to the beſt ſenſe.

conſequently needs pardon, and the Blood of Chriſt. Now if it be true that he ſaith, that, No Law of God requires any more than that men keep the main ſubſtantials of it, and make Religion their buſineſs; then he may ſafely affirm, that they do not need pardon by the Blood of Chriſt, for any ſo much as temporal puniſhment as to thoſe failings that are conſiſtent with true Chriſtianity. I grant the Goſpel requires no more for our Juſtification and Salvation, than ſuch ſincere imperfect indeavours as he mentions: but I cannot enough expreſs my diſlike, of ſaying, No Law doth require any more.

Secondly, If the Law was abrogated by Chriſts ſatisfaction, and the Goſpel, as to its requiring perfect Obedience under a threatning of the penalty of Eternal death, of thoſe that continue performing the Goſpel-condition; Then we muſt not ſay, that Chriſt died to obtain the pardon of thoſe ſins that are conſiſtent with Goſpel-ſincerity, but died to prevent them from being Sins, and Tranſgreſſions of the Law, that would otherwiſe have been ſins; or to

pre-

prevent such sins from legally deser-
ving, or being threatned with Eternal
wrath, and so to prevent them from be-
ing pardoned by his Blood, as to Eter-
nal wrath.

Secondly, Another great Mistake that causeth his other Errors, (as any one may perceive that reads his Book) is this, That he doth not understand, or doth not consider the difference between an Original Law, with a Remedying Law, or conditional Act of Oblivion distinct from the Original Law; and a Law that threatens a transgressour of it, only conditionally. I shall make my meaning appear by an Instance which he brings of an Original Law, and a Remedying Law (though I confess he brings it not under that notion, but speaks somthing not right concerning it, and especially he is widely mistaken in making that the chief, yea, the only Law of *Moses* that the Apostle speaks against Justification by in those places, where he speaks against Justification by the works of the Law, though yet I do think that the Apostle had in some places a main respect to this Law

of

of Sacrifices now to be mentioned, as *Acts* 13. 38, 39. *Heb.* 7. 11. 19. *Chap.* 9. *v.* 8. 18. *Chap.* 10. *v.* 1. *&c.* The Inſtance is this, *Page* 121, 122. where he rightly tells us; "That God did "make a Law that concerned the *Jews* "as a Common-wealth, that every one "that tranſgreſſed the Law ſhould die "by a violent death, (*viz.* Either I ſuppoſe by the Sword of the Magiſtrate if publickly known, or God would in Judgment cut them off himſelf) "But "God in mercy, that the whole Com-"munity might not be deſtroyed by the "death of the Multitude of Offenders (and alſo I ſuppoſe to Typifie our greateſt concernments in reference to another life) "made another Law concern-"ing the moſt of thoſe offences (for "ſome offences were for great reaſons "excepted from this Act of Oblivion, "and were to be puniſhed with tempo-"ral death without mercy) that if the "Offender offer a Sacrifice, he ſhould "be ſpared, and it ſhould be accepted "in his ſtead. Now to the matter in hand: Suppoſe that the firſt of theſe Laws had it ſelf run thus conditionally,

that

that if any man commit any ſuch offence He ſhall die a violent temporal death, or ſome Beaſt for him. In this caſe, we could not have ſaid, that this Law required the Offender's blood, but his or the Beaſts indifferently; neither could we have ſaid if he had offered a Beaſt, that he was pardoned; ſince the Law threatned not his death, but his or the Beaſt's, and ſo there was nothing of remitting, or pardoning any thing the Law required: We could not ſay that the Beaſt died as a ſatisfaction to the Law, that the Law might not be executed; for if the Beaſt died, the Law was Executed, according to the utmoſt ſeverity that it threatned without pardon; We could not ſay the Beaſt died to expiate his guilt and obligation to die; for he never was guilty of Death, never was threatned with death by this Law, but He was to die, or thus part with his Beaſt indifferently.

But now, conſider this Inſtance as it was in truth an Original Law, threatning the Offender's death abſolutely, and a Remedying Law diſtinct; and we here ſee, that an Original Law and Remedy-

medying Law, are well consistent both in force. We cannot say, that the Original Law that threatned the offender's death absolutely, was null'd, or abrogated by this Remedying Law, but it remained in force; only there was a Remedying Law in mercy, provided to free from the penalty, that, though due to the first Law, it should not be executed. We cannot say, the offender's death was not threatned by the Law, or that he was not guilty of death by that Law; we cannot say, the Beast died to hinder the man from being guilty of death, so far as concerns the Law: but that, though he was * guilty by that Law, that he should not be guilty with the *reatus redundans in personam*, that it should not be inflicted. You cannot say, the man was not pardoned as to his death, because the Beast died for him; for he was pardoned, the Law was not executed; for it threatned his death absolutely: nor, that the Beast did not die a

+ We read expressly, that in the case of sacrifice for sin, there was guilt, or obligation to the punishment, and attonement, or expiation, and pardon, or forgiveness, *Lev.* 5. v. 1. 4 10. 17, 18, 19. compared. So *Chap.* 6. v 4 7. And all these well consistent. Yea, pardon cannot be at all, without a Law in force obliging to punishment, for the offence pardoned.

ſatisfaction to Juſtice, that the Law might not be Executed, by pretending the Law was executed without pardon, by the death of the Beaſt. So, that Original-Law, [*Curſed is every one*, with a curſe after this Life, *that obeys not in every thing*,] may be actually in force conſiſtent with the Remedying Law, the Goſpel, That if a man be a ſincere Chriſtian, a ſincere Servant of God in the main, he ſhall be free from that Curſe. You cannot ſay, If a man be a ſincere Chriſtian, perform the Goſpel-condition, he ſins not againſt any Law in force; nor, that the ſins that are conſiſtent with true Chriſtianity, are not threatned with Eternal death; or, that he is not condemned dayly for ſuch ſins by that Law; or, that he is not pardoned as to Eternal death, as to thoſe ſins, pretending that no Law in force threatens them with Eternal death; or, that there cannot be an Expiation for them, they not being ſins, or threatned with any Eternal penalty: You cannot ſay, that Chriſt died not a ſatisfaction to Juſtice, that the Law-threat might not be executed, pretending the Law was exe-

executed without pardon; for the Law threatned us absolutely, and not Christ at all.

Thirdly, Another great cause of his Mistakes, is, his not understanding the difference between *Natural-Impotency* (which is when a man hath not the Natural Faculties, or Abilities to do a thing, as being a Natural-Fool, or Deaf, or Blind, or hath not a sufficient proposal of the Object to be known, or believed; and they that have not this Natural-power of doing a thing, are not bound by the Law of God, to do what they have this Natural-impotency to, and so do not sin in the not doing it) and *Moral-Impotency*, which is wilful wickedness, and doth not in the least excuse men from obedience to the commands they have only this Impotency to the obeying of. Now the not understanding of this, causes that Self-contradicting Notion of his, from *pag.* 104. to *pag.* 114. where he contradicts himself most fluently, in almost his whole Discourse (I do not much wonder at this, since every man must necessarily contradict himself in

all he ſaith about ſuch things, that doth not keep notions clear and diſtinct about this Diſtinction, which too few do) where he tells us, "He cannot be of "the judgment of the moſt, who hold, "that the Law doth oblige men, if not "abſolutely, yet conditionally, except "they flie to the Covenant of Grace, "and that under the peril of Eternal "death to abſolute Obedience, that is, "ſuch Obedience as excludes all ſin. And for this reaſon, he cannot be of this Judgment, Becauſe no man can do it. And adds *pag.* 108, "That there-"fore he holds, that the Law threatens "only thoſe that do not do all things "the Law requires them to do: What? Is not this perfect Obedience even to Innocency, to do all the Law requires men to do? If a man do all the Law requires him to do, he doth perfectly obey the Law; he doth not ſin except he fail in ſomething the Law requires from him. Strange ſpeech! No Law of God he ſaith, requires perfect Obedience, becauſe no man can perform perfect Obedience; therefore the Law requires no more than a man can perform.

form. Is not this to ſay, That the Law doth only require what a man can do, and yet all a man can do, is not all the Law requires, is not perfect Obedience. If no Law require a man to be free from thoſe ſins he ſpeaks of, that are conſiſtent with Chriſtianity, then thoſe ſins are lawful; and the doing of ſuch things as are lawful, cannot hinder a man from being innocent; can be no hindrance to his perfect obeying the Law.

Yea, it is a Contradiction in the very Words, keeping to the ſame Law (as the Authour doth) to ſay, Any Law doth not require perfect Obedience; for it is to ſay it doth not require all that it doth require. We may indeed ſay, the Goſpel doth not require the perfect Obedience of another Law, that is, the whole condition of the Original Law, which it was made to pardon our failure in; becauſe ſincere Obedience only to that Original-Law, was made the condition of it: but it is impoſſible but the Goſpel being a Law (it is a Law of Grace, commanding ſincere obedience, with a penalty of our otherwiſe not having

ving the benefit offered by it); I ſay, it is impoſſible, but that it ſhould require perfect Obedience to what it doth require as it's condition, whereon we ſhall attain the pardon offered by it; and this condition is perfectly all that it doth require as a Remedying-Law, or Act of Oblivion: For, if there be any thing that it doth not require of us, ſo as we ſhould loſe the offered Pardon if we do not perform it; this thing is not it's condition, nor any part of it, which is required, that we might not ſo fall ſhort. Alſo, as was demonſtrated before, No Law either doth, or can, remit any thing required by it ſelf. If a man fail in any thing required by the Goſpel, under the penalty of having no benefit by it, he is Remedileſs.

Fourthly, Another fundamental cauſe of his Miſtake of the Apoſtle's ſenſe, is, want of true notions about the Law of *Moſes*, which he thinks to be a Law that had only Temporal Promiſes and Threats, and to be void of Spiritual and Internal commands; and alſo that the Apoſtle only excludes it, and its works, from Juſtification. Now becauſe I know

know not of any that ſpeak exactly, and ſatisfactorily of the Law, in the ſeveral Notions and Acceptations of it, nor in all things * rightly, (however not in my judgment, which in this may poſſibly differ from all others); I think it needful to ſpeak here ſomething largely and diſtinctly of it; not to deſtroy the Author's Opinion about the Apoſtle's ſenſe, ſince that may be done in few words: but that I may lay a foundation for the right underſtanding, not only of the paſſages of the Apoſtles in debate, but other paſſages alſo of this Apoſtle, and of the Authour to the *Hebrews*, reſpecting the Law; where they take it in a different ſenſe from that wherein it is mainly taken in the places now in diſpute. My thoughts are theſe:

* I mean, not rightly, only becauſe not comprehenſibly enough, ſo as to include all the ſenſes of it here to be mentioned.

The Law of *Moſes*, or Old Teſtament-diſpenſation, may be conſidered as to Temporal reſpects only; or, as to Conſcience, or Life-to-come Concernments.

And firſt, to ſpeak of it as to Tem-

poral concernments only, it may in this respect be considered, either strictly, or as affording pardon.

1. The Law of *Moses* may be considered as to Temporal respects, in its utmost exacting Rigour, I mean in its utmost Rigour, threatning Temporal Punishments; as Dearth, or Barrenness to their Land; and, by that, Calamity to the Community; as also by Pestilence and Banishment out of their Land, to be executed by God: And as the Instrument of the Jewish Polity, or Common-wealth (for they had no other Temporal-Law of their Land) threatning violent and untimely Death to all * Transgressors of it, to be Exe-

* It threatned as the Common-wealth-Law, this violent death to every external visible Breach, whether Omission or Commission, of every express Law, either Moral, Judicial, or Ceremonial. This appears plain enough by that Sanction, Cursed is every one that continues not in all things, &c. The penalty was threatned to every Transgressor, and what this penalty was, appears by its contrary, the Life promised to the Obedient, which all will grant to contain temporal Life: But it most undeniably appears by that of a Beast's blood being offered in stead of the offender's. I do not think, it threatned as the Common-wealth-law, this death to a breach in thought or will, without any visible (I mean by this word, that may be seen, or Externally perceived, if any man was by to perceive it) external Omission, or Commission; nor to a not-express, but only by remote consequence implied breach; nor was the Magistrate bound to inflict death on the offender, guilty of such sinful thoughts or desires, or refusing to offer sacrifice for them, though it some way came to his knowledg, as by the parties confessing such inward sins to him, and declaring his resolution, not to offer sacrifice for them: Yea, it seems apparent, that none of their sacrifices were to be offered for such Internal sins.

cuted

cuted by the Magiſtrate; or if ſecret from him, or in the Magiſtrate's neglect or default, by God himſelf, *Lev.* 20. 3, 4, 5. Yea, and it enjoyned excluſion from Society, and from the Congregation, for pollutions, *Lev.* 15. *Numb.* 19. Which were, at leaſt moſt of them, no ſins (though ſo called figuratively) not being forbidden, being generally altogether Involuntary; and it might often be, a man's duty to pollute himſelf; as for Example, by Burying the Dead. Though yet it was a ſin (yea, and might be a preſumptuous ſin in the ſenſe of *Numb.* 15. 30.) to neglect wittingly the Expiation, or Purgation in that caſe appointed, and alſo to come into ſociety, till the Purgation finiſhed. This would take up too much time to ſpeak more particularly & exactly of.

I would ſpeak more plain if poſſible: let me Repeat it in other words, which may be plainer to ſome underſtandings. I ſay, the Law may be conſidered in this External political ſenſe, *viz.* ſo far as the Offences might be Expiated by their Sacrifices, or were excluded poſitively by it, from being expiated by their Sacrifices (for that Excluſion was meant

meant only as to Temporal punishment, taking no notice of the Future or Eternal): In this sence, it had only, as Temporal punishments of Offenders, so only Temporal promises of Peace, or Prosperity, or Long-Life in the Land of *Canaan*, upon obedience to the Law; and also had, in this sense, no Spiritual or Internal precepts. Now the Law in this strict temporal sense, wherein it threatned such calamities to every Offender, was a shadow of things to come, Punishments to come; a Shadow and Commemoration of the same (I mean, materially the same) Law's * severe threatnings of Future punishments to every Transgression, either External, or Internal; *And a shadow* or pattern *of Good things to come*, Heb. 10. 1. and *of Heavenly things*, Heb. 9. 28. of the same (in another sense) Law's promises of future Heavenly happiness to perfect Obedience; and was much suited to put them in mind of the great Concernments of the same Law, as pertaining to Conscience, and the future Life.

* *It was a strangely severe Common-wealth-law (even beyond Draco's Laws, that, for their severity, were said to be writ in Blood) and this severity would even appear irrational and unaccountable unto us, did we not consider its typicalness, and representation of the great strictness of the same law in a higher sense, cursing with eternal death, every one not continuing in all, &c. And also, did we not consider that it was given with a Remedying Law, accepting the blood of beasts, in stead of a man's, in most cases.*

2. Still

2. Still keeping to Temporal Concerns. This amazingly-ſtrict Law as to Temporal puniſhment, may be conſidered as given with, or comprehending in it, a Remedying-Law, as to theſe Temporal ſeverities, *viz.* As affording pardon upon Sacrifice, as to theſe threatned Deſtructions, for the moſt Tranſgreſſions; (not for all, as one may be apt to wiſh, for Type-ſake; for the community muſt not be fundamentally prejudiced to make a Type more full, by pardoning all offences as to Temporal puniſhment upon ſacrifice.) And ſo this Political Temporal-Law was (I will not ſay the Goſpel it ſelf, for it was not, but), if I may ſpeak, a little Goſpel in reality, a Law of Pardon as to the Temporal puniſhment threatned; and a Shadow or * pattern, or Repreſentation of its own (materially conſidered) Goſpel favour in admitting Tranſgreſſors of it to favour

* *I doubt not but the Book of the Law in the Temporal ſenſe I am now upon, being ſprinkled with blood, was a pattern of the Laws, in the Eternal ſenſe I ſhall after ſpeak of, being ſprinkled with a better ſacrifice, and that the Law in this laſt ſenſe, was one of thoſe heavenly things ſpoken of, Heb. 9. 19, 23. Though the Heavenly things mentioned, do moſt immediately denote the more clear Diſpenſation of the Goſpel then in being, when thoſe words were written.*

favour, as to its Obligation to Future and Eternal puniſhment, by pardon upon the account of a great Satisfaction to come, which ſuch ſacrifices Typified.

Now it is apparent, that the Law and Covenant, or Teſtament of *Moſes*, is often taken in the New Teſtament in this ſenſe, *viz.* For the Law under this conſideration, ſo far as it threatned only what might be remitted by Sacrifice, or threatned what was denied by it to be remitted upon Sacrifice. Yea, no man can poſſibly give any rational account of the meaning of the Author to the *Hebrews*, in the places where he ſpeaks of the Law; but by affirming, he takes it in this ſenſe, as *Chap.* 7. 8, 9, 10. For the Law, only in this ſenſe was Typical; and not at all Typical, but the reallity, in the ſenſe I ſhall after ſpeak of it in. He ſhews, the Law made nothing perfect as to Conſcience, or future Concernments; and that Sacrifices did not Expiate any further than as to the puriſying of the Fleſh that they might come into the Congregation, and to the

the taking off of Temporal guilt and Puniſhment; but not as to Eternal, or Future-life puniſhment; or coming to the Congregation in Heaven; and alſo ſhews that they were a commemoration (ἀνάμνησις) of Sins as to Conſcience, and the Future puniſhment, but not an Expiation, *Heb.* 10. 3, 4. And that they did ſo far (*viz.* as to Temporal puniſhment, and being excluded the Congregation) really Expiate being offered in the offender's ſtead: And, elſe indeed they could not have been Typical of the great Expiation, if they were not Expiations as to ſome things themſelves; no more than the Brazen-Serpent could have been a Type of Chriſt's Healing or Saving, if it had never healed any. So the Law of *Moſes* is taken alſo, *Acts* 13. 39. *By him all that believe, are juſtified from all things, from which you could not be juſtified by the Law of* Moſes. That is, from all ſuch great Crimes, as Idolatry, Murder, *&c.* for which there was no pardon in the Law of *Moſes*, taken in this ſenſe; but ſuch were to die without mercy, no Sacrifice being appointed,

or

or accepted in their ſtead: Though yet there was pardon for ſuch by the Law of *Moſes*, taken in the ſenſe I ſhall ſpeak of it in, *viz.* In the ſenſe wherein it was the Goſpel made in the Blood of Chriſt, and in the ſenſe wherein *David* was, yea, and all others were, Juſtified and Saved by it.

For it is apparent, that a man might go to Heaven upon true Repentance by that Law (taken in the conſideration, I ſhall ere long ſpeak of it in) that Temporal death without mercy (*Heb.* 10. 28.) was due to, by that Law: no Expiation being allowed for his ſin, he ſinning contemptuouſly, or preſumptuouſly, or with a high hand, in the ſenſe of thoſe words, *Numb.* 15. 30. (which are *Heb.* 10. 28. interpreted by ἀθετήσας, *He that* contemptuouſly *ſinned againſt*, or ſet-at-nought, *Moſes Law*, *i. e.* in ſome ſtubborn and vain-glorious way;) or he committing Idolatry, Adultery, or Murder, or ſome other particular Crime excluded, as Blaſphemy, Witchcraft, Curſing or Smiting his Father or Mother, defiling the Sabbath, or being a ſtubborn and rebellious Son. As for

for Inſtance, *David* was pardoned and went to Heaven, and he never offered Sacrifice for thoſe his Crimes; for there was none appointed or admitted in ſuch caſe; for he was by that Law, in the ſenſe in hand, to Die without mercy; and ſhould have been put to Death, had there been any Superiour Authority on Earth to do it; except ſome Prophet had come from God, who, being chief Rector, could diſpenſe with his own Laws, to tell ſuch Authothority, that God had pardoned him as to Temporal puniſhment; or God, had ſome way notified, he would not have the Law executed on him. And it is alſo apparent, that a man might be guilty of no Fault, threatned by the Law in this ſenſe, but what was fully Expiated by his Sacrifices, as to Temporal violent Death, and Excluſion from Society; and yet go to Hell, being no true Penitent, or ſincere Servant of God. Becauſe all the Crimes that a man might poſſibly be only guilty of, might be Expiable, and newly Expiated by Sacrifice, ſo far as their Sacrifices could expiate, though he never truly

truly repented. It was only in ſome few caſes of Injuſtice, that there was Confeſſion to the party, and Reſtitution to the party wronged, required, elſe this Sacrifice was not accepted to Remiſſion as to Temporal guilt, *Lev.*5.5. *Chap.* 6. 2, 3, 4, 5.

I would have ſpoken more largely and particularly, of the Law under this Conſideration; and have given an account here, why the Apoſtles ſometimes take it only in this ſenſe (which I ſuppoſe, I ſhall do ſome-where upon occaſion, before I have done) but I am ſenſible I am ſomething out of my way in ſpeaking ſo largely here, as I have done. And now I have thus ſpoken, I can make little more than this uſe of it, ſhould I keep ſtrictly to ſpeaking of the places of the Apoſtle in diſpute, than to lay it quite, or almoſt aſide; and to make it appear that the Author had done well, unleſs he had ſpoken more exactly of it, to have done ſo; and to wiſh every one would do ſo, (*viz.* would lay it aſide) for interrupting them, when ſpeaking or thinking of the Apoſtle *Pauls* meaning, in moſt

moſt of the places in diſpute, *viz.* Places denying Juſtification by the Law, and Works of the Law; ſince it is apparent, he ſpeaks of Juſtification as to Conſcience, and Future life, and ſpeaks of *Moſes* Law as referring to Conſcience, and Future life, (which ſenſe I now come to ſpeak of that Law in.)

Secondly, The Law of *Moſes* may be conſidered as to Conſcience (Conſcience eſſentially reſpects the Future ſtate) and Life to come-concernments, *viz.* as requiring Obedience with a promiſe of Future happineſs, and under the Peril of Future or Eternal death; and alſo as Remitting and Pardoning ſins, as to Future miſery. Now in this high important ſenſe, this ſame Law (I mean materially, and in words the *ſame*) muſt be conſidered, both as a ſtrict Law, and a gracious Law or Goſpel. What is a Law, but a ſignification of the Rector's will any way whatſoever, obliging the Subjects to Obedience, by promiſing rewards to the Obedient, and threatning puniſhment to the Diſobedient. Now in this very

Law in this high ſenſe, there are ſignifications of his Will, both of an Original ſtrict Law, conſtituting Eternal or Future death due to every Tranſgreſſor; and of a Remedying-law, promiſing Pardon to Tranſgreſſors upon Repentance, and ſincere Obedience: even as in the Temporal conſideration of the Law, (already ſpoken of) there was a Law requiring the Offender's blood upon his failing in the leaſt in it; elſe there could have been no Pardon of him as to violent death upon a Sacrifice, if the Law had not threatned death to him; and alſo there was the Remedying-law of Pardon upon a Sacrifice: So here this conſideration, This very Law given in the ſame words at *Sinai*, did Reveal and Signifie theſe formally-diſtinct Laws.

Firſt, A ſtrict exacting of Obedience all their lives, to all that he commanded, under the peril of Future death, or wrath to come; elſe, as I have made apparent before, there could be no Pardon as to wrath to come, or Satisfaction by Chriſt for wrath to come, due by this Law, as to ſuch ſins.

And

And in this ſtrict ſence, the Apoſtle *Paul* uſeth the word Law in the moſt of thoſe places in Diſpute, which the Author chiefly inſiſts on, to reconcile them to St. *James*, *viz.* the *3d.* and *4th.* Chapter to the *Romans*; and *Gal. 3. v.* 10, 11, 12, 13. And in this ſenſe the Law was no Type or Shaddow, nor to vaniſh away, but ſtands in Force unto this day.

Secondly, Alſo it did Reveal, that though they ſhould ſometimes during their life (which is enough for Condemnation by this Law in the firſt ſenſe) fail in obedience to it; yet their condition ſhould not be hopeleſs, the Puniſhment made due to them by this Law ſhould be pardoned, and they ſhould yet enjoy the promiſed Future life, upon condition they did Repent, and ſincerely love and ſerve God, endeavouring Obedience to all his Laws, Moral, Judicial, and Ceremonial, with the prevailing deſign, and bent of their Souls. Now in this ſenſe, the Law of *Moſes* was no Type or Shaddow, but the very Goſpel, the Word of Faith which the Apoſtles Preached, *Rom.* 10.

6, 7, 8. And in this ſenſe, *David* takes the Law in moſt of his Encomiums of it, and in this ſenſe Juſtification and Salvation, are not denied to it, or the Works of it, by the Apoſtle, to them that lived under this Diſpenſation; nor to us by it: For it yet continues the ſame for ſubſtance, having the ſame Sanction, and Condition, or Precept in the general, *viz.* That if we ſinners repent, and ſincerely obey all his Commands, he will be our God to Bleſs us, to Juſtifie and Save us from all our ſins; Though many of the former particular Precepts are ceaſed, and ſome new ones added, and the whole Diſpenſation more intelligible and clear. It is apparent that the Law of *Moſes*, though it was given deſignedly (as to the end of the Revelation of it) as a Covenant of Grace and Pardon, even for the Salvation of ſinners, and not for their Deſtruction; yet it was given (ſubſerviently ſtill as to the ſame end of Salvation) alſo to Reveal the Law in its utmoſt exacting Rigour. For though an Original ſtrict Law may really be, and ſo may be Revealed without a Remedying

dying-Law; yet it is a plain impossibility to Reveal, (however so as Offenders should be sensible of pardon and favour in it) a Remedying-Law of Pardon (as this from Mount *Sinai*, mainly as to the design of it, was) without Revealing and making known the strict Original-Law. For, without knowing what the Law in its Rigor requires from us, and what it threatens to them that fail in the least, we cannot be thankful for Pardon offered on the Gospel-terms of Sincerity, nor know, we stand in need of Pardon so we be but sincere. Neither can this Author possibly reconcilably to his Principles (as you will see) tell us how Pardon is either needful to one, or possibly consistent with, performing the Gospel-condition, since he maintains, That sincere imperfect Obedience, or the Gospel-condition, is all that any Law of God so much as requires. Thus you see my Judgment concerning the Law of *Moses*, And that I suppose that Threat [*Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written*] had these four significations, or did notifie these four

diſtinct Sanctions, with their diſtinct Conditions. 1*ſt*. Every one ſhall be puniſhed with a violent Temporal death, or, ſuch death ſhall be due to him, that obſerveth not every External Precept. 2*ly*. Every one ſhall remedileſſy be puniſhed with the foreſaid death, that offendeth in the great Inſtances exempted from Pardon, or in other faults, and obſerveth not the Sacrifices appointed for the Expiation of them. 3*ly*. Future Death or Wrath to come, ſhall be due to every one that obeyeth not every Command, both Internal, and External. 4*ly*. This Future-death ſhall remedileſſy befal every ſuch Offender that ſhall not repent of his ſins, and ſincerely endeavour obedience to every Command, Internal, and External. And to the like extenſive Import, *mutatis mutandis*, that Promiſe [The man that doth them, ſhall live in or by them] may and ought to be Interpreted.

Now you will ſee theſe four grand Miſtakes which I have here ſpoken to, cauſing the failings of his whole Diſcourſe, in determining what the Apoſtle *Paul* means by Works, and by the Law,

in

in denying Juſtification by Works, and by the Law; which Diſcourſe I ſhall now propound to your View, Tranſcribing ſome of it Verbatim, yea, all that is Argumentative in it, without leaving out any thing in the leaſt material, and telling you when I leave out any thing that is not, but may ſeem material. Which I thus begin,

The Author having before made it apparent, that though Faith in ſome other paſſages of the Apoſtle, doth mean one particular Grace; yet in thoſe Speeches where he ſpeaks of Juſtification by it in oppoſition to Works, he means by Faith all required to Salvation, the obedience of Faith: He tells us, *Chap. 6. pag. 98.* "That the Apoſtle doth not "exclude all Works from Juſtification, "but Works of the Law of *Moſes*, and "that in ſo doing, in excluding them, "he doth alſo reject the corrupt Inter-"pretations or Opinions, which the "*Scribes* and *Phariſees*, had faſtned on "this Law, or added to it: And alſo "that the Apoſtle, though ſpeaking lit-"tle about it, and on the bie, doth im-"plicitly affirm that Works done ac-

" cording to the Law of Nature, and " proceeding from the ſtrength of Na- " ture, doth avail nothing to Salva- " tion.

Chap. 7. He tells us what works of the Laws of *Moſes* in theſe words, *pag.* 101. " This Law conſiſts of two Parts, " *viz.* of Moral and Ritual Precepts: " The Apoſtle without doubt had re- " ſpect to them both. For that he " ſpeaks alſo of the Moral Precepts of " the Law of *Moſes*, whatever ſome " ſay to the contrary, is too manifeſt " out of his own words, *Rom.* 3. 20. " *Wherefore by the Works of the Law,* " *ſhall no fleſh be juſtified in his* " *ſight: for by the Law is the knowledg* " *of ſin.* From whence it may be gather- " ed, that it is that Law by which is " the knowledg of ſin, whoſe works he " he excludes; which without contro- " verſie is ſpoken of the Moral-Law " written in the Decalogue. For ſo " the Apoſtle expounds himſelf, *Rom.* " 7. 7. citing that out of the Deca- " logue, *Thou ſhalt not Covet.* So *Rom.* " 3. 31. *Do we deſtroy the Law by* " *Faith? God forbid, yea, we eſtabliſh*

the

"*the Law.* Now the Ceremonial-
"Law, can ſcarce be ſaid to be eſta-
"bliſhed by Faith. The Law worketh
"wrath: For, where there is no Law,
"there is no Tranſgreſſion, is chiefly
"true of the Moral-Law: For almoſt,
"all Tranſgreſſions are againſt the Mo-
"ral-Law; therefore the Diſpute of
"the Apoſtle, pertains alſo to the
"Works of the Moral-Law. In the
"mean time, I muſt add this, that the
"Works of the Moral-Law, are not
"ſimply excluded by *Paul* from Juſti-
"fication, but only ſo far as they
"were preſcribed in the *Moſaic-Cove-*
"*nant*, and were made part of the
"condition annexed to this Covenant.
"It is certain that no man could come
"to true Juſtification by the *Moſaic-*
"*Covenant*, by Works of the Moral-
"Law, though they were rightly, yea,
"and exactly performed, according
"to the Rule of the Law, becauſe, it
"promiſed no true Juſtification at all,
"That is, Juſtification joyned with E-
"ternal-Life. For, that great Bene-
"fit comes only from the Covenant of
"Grace, made in the Blood of the
"Me-

"Mediator. So that, if you reſpect "the *Moſaic-Covenant*, even the works "of the Moral-Law, are together to "be excluded from Juſtification, and "are indeed excluded by the Apo-"ſtle.

I know you are at a loſs about the Author's meaning; what he means by this *Moſaic-Covenant*, that no man could be juſtified by, as to Future life, though free all ſin, and perfectly obeying the Moral-Law; becauſe, this *Moſaic-Covenant*, promiſed no Juſtification as to Eternal life, upon any terms whatſoever. Now becauſe you will not underſtand what he ſaith here, on the two Arguments he brings in the next words, which he pretends are only the Apoſtle's Arguments againſt Juſtification by this *Moſaic-Covenant*, and that this is all the Law and Covenant, that the Apoſtle proves againſt Juſtification by; I will bring together here, all that he ſaith, to tell us what he means by the *Moſaic-Covenant*, that there is no Juſtification by, as he ſaith, as to a Future life, though there was as to this Life; and you will ſee it apparent, that he

he means by it only that Law, or Laws, which I before cited out of him, by the name of an Original-Law, and Remedying-Law, which threatned a violent Temporal death to the Tranſgreſſors of the Law; and promiſed, upon offering a Sacrifice, they ſhould eſcape ſuch violent Temporal death; but promiſed nothing of Happineſs in a Future life, if they offered ſuch Sacrifices; or Pardon of thoſe ſins as to a Future life: He apparently either means this Remedying-Law only, or both together; the Original-Law, as it threatned a violent Temporal death, and the Remedying-Law freeing from a violent Temporal death, upon the death of a Beaſt: And he thinks, that the Law taken in ſuch a ſenſe as to threaten Eternal death, or promiſe Eternal life, was the Goſpel it ſelf, and that *Paul* doth not diſpute againſt being Juſtified by any ſuch Law; And that the Law given from Mount *Sinai* however had no Promiſes or Threats of a Future life, not ſo much as obſcure ones; and he builds the ſenſe he gives of the Apoſtle *Paul* upon this Foundation. You have

have ſeen this paſſage already, where he ſaith, it promiſed no Eternal life-Juſtification, to any whatſoever, though Sinleſs, and perfectly keeping the Law, *Pag.* 208. "The Promiſes and "Threatnings of the Law, were only "Temporal and Earthly, *Pag.* 210. "And the Precepts did wonderfully ac-"cord with the Promiſes *Pag.* 212. He ſpeaks largely to prove this. "The "Apoſtle doth in many places tax this "defect of the *Moſaic-Law*, that it had "no promiſe of a Future life. And "hither ſome refer that Text, *Rom.* "8. 3. where it is ſaid, *The Law was* "*weak through the Fleſh*, i. e. ſay they, "It contained only carnal Promiſes: "But I chuſe rather the common Inter-"pretation, *viz.* of *Fleſh*, for *Sin.* "The 5*th.* verſe of the foregoing "Chapter, is more appoſite, where the "Law is called *Fleſh*; for thoſe words, "*When we were in the Fleſh*, muſt be ex-"pounded, *When we were under the Law*, "as is manifeſt from the Antitheſis, "which they have to *Verſ.* 6. and alſo "from the ſcope of the whole Chap-"ter. And the *Moſaic-Law* ſeems to

"be

"be called *Fleſh*; not only becauſe the
"moſt of the Precepts were carnal only,
"and External, but alſo becauſe the
"Promiſes with which this Law was
"enforced, did not look beyond this
"Carnal life. To the ſame ſenſe *Gro-*
"*tius* expounds the words of the Apo-
"ſtle, 2 *Cor.* 3. where he calls the
"Law, *a Miniſtry of Death*, becauſe
"all its Promiſes were ended with
"Death, without any hope of Reſti-
"tution. So *v.* 6. The Law of *Moſes*
"is ſaid to kill, *viz.* as the ſame *Gro-*
"*tius* notes; As the *Hebrew* word to
"make *alive*, is uſed of him who did
"not kill a man, *Exod.* 1. 17. *Judg.*
"8. 19. So, that is ſaid to kill,
"which leaves a man to die, and doth
"not free from Death. But that I may
"confeſs the truth, I rather believe
"theſe Phraſes [to Kill, and a Mi-
"niſtry of death] to ſignifie ſome-
"thing elſe, *viz.* the written Law
"of *Moſes*, to make men Obnoxi-
"ous to Divine anger, and Eternal
"death, if it be alone, and deſti-
"tute of the Spirit; not through

its

† It is well, he here grants it is through the default of the Man, and not from the Law; but this deſtroys his cauſe; and He a few Lines after, contradicts this.

"its † own fault, "but through the "infirmity of the "Fleſh. The Apo-"ſtle's words, *Gal.* "3. 13. ſeem more clear. *The Law* "*is not of Faith, but he that doth them,* "*ſhall live in them:* That is, the Law "neither requires Faith, neither doth "it promiſe thoſe things which require "Faith or Belief, properly ſo called "(*which is the evidence of things not* "*ſeen*, Heb. 11. 1. Rom. 8. 24.) be-"cauſe it promiſes only good things of "that ſort, which are things of Senſe, "and belong to this viſible World, but "ſaith not a tittle concerning a Future "life: It excites us not to Piety, with "any promiſes of this ſort; but re-"quires that we do its commands, not "adding any ſuch promiſe to excite us: "Only ſaying, *Thou ſhalt live* here a "proſperous and fortunate life, as ap-"pears, *Lev.* 18. 5. but that place, "*Gal.* 3. 21. is moſt clear: *If there* "*had been a Law which could have gi-*"*ven life, verily Righteouſneſs ſhould*

have

"*have been by that Law.* The Law is "ſaid to give, or do, what it pro- "miſes. The ſenſe "thereof is, If the "* Law had had "promiſes of life, "(*viz.* Eternal) "then men could have attained by the "Law, true and perfect Righteouſneſs, "or true and perfect Juſtification; that "is, Juſtification conjoyned with Eter- "nal life: But the matter was far o- "therwiſe, the Law contains only pro- "miſes belonging to this Life.

* Here He lays the fault on the Law, and denies it virtually to be the fault of the Man, unſaying what he had ſaid before,

Being no better ſupplied with proofs, than with theſe out of the Apoſtle *Paul*, he brings ſome out of the Author to the *Hebrews*; and might have brought many more, and clearer, to ſhew, that Author means by the Law, the Law of Sacrifices, which Sacrifices did only expiate Temporal guilt, as real propitiatory Sacrifices; and not at all guilt as to Eternal puniſhment, but only Typified that which did.

"*Pag.* 215. Queſt. *Is there no pro-* "*miſe of Eternal life, extant in the* "*Old Teſtament?* *Anſw.* Either you mean

"mean by the Old Teſtament, the "Covenant made in Mount *Sinai*; or "all things contained in *Moſes*, the *Ha-* "*giography*, and the Prophets. If ta- "ken in the latter ſenſe, it may per- "haps be granted, there are ſome, not "obſcure, hints of a Future life, though "not a clear and expreſs Promiſe of E- "ternal life. But theſe hints, ſuch as "they were, were only *Præludiums*, "and *Anticipations* of Goſpel-Grace. "They did not belong to the Law. "For the Law as it is conſidered by "the Apoſtle in his Diſputations with "the *Jews*, doth properly denote the "Covenant made in Mount *Sinai*, *Gal.* "4. 24. And that, had earthly Pro- "miſes, and earthly only. It is true "indeed, that thoſe earthly Promiſes, "added to the Law of Works, were "ſigns of thoſe good things which did "follow the Law of the Spirit, and "thoſe were comprehended in them, "in the intention of God himſelf. It "is alſo true, that there are extant ſome "general Promiſes, or Promiſes made "in general terms, in the Law it ſelf, "in which it is manifeſt, that Eternal

life

"life not only might be, but was con-
"tained in Gods Intention, As [*I will*
"*be thy God, and I will Bless you*]. For,
"who doubts but in these Promises
"thus generally pronounced, there
"might be contained every sort of good
"things, yea, those which come only
"after Death? For God to be willing
"to be one's God, what is it else, then
"God to be willing to embrace a man
"with Divine good Will? Now Di-
"vine good Will, or Benignity wor-
"thy of God, What is it else than the
"highest Benignity, and than which
"there can be no greater, or further?
"And therefore with a Benignity most
"long in duration, that is Eternal;
"most powerful in Operation, and
"therefore freeing from Death and
"Destruction. For, it is manifest by
"the Interpretation of Christ himself,
"and his Apostles, that Life-eternal
"in the Intention of God, was com-
"prehended in these words, see *Mat.*
"22.31,32. *Heb.*11.16. 2 *Cor.*6.16,
"17, 18. compared with *Chap.* 7. 1.
"*Rev.*21.3.7. But these things do not
"suffice that we may say, that Life-eter-

" nal was promiſed in the *Moſaic-Cove-*
" *nant.* For, Promiſes annexed to a
" Covenant, ought to be clear and ex-
" preſs, and ſuch as may be underſtood
" by either Party: but it was almoſt im-
" poſſible that any one ſhould under-
" ſtand theſe Typical, and general Pro-
" miſes, without ſome adventitious In-
" terpretation. Again, this Eternal-
" life ſhadowed with Types, and com-
" prehended in theſe general Promiſes,
" was not given to the external Righ-
" teouſneſs required in the Letter of
" the Law; but to that ſpiritual Puri-
" ty and Piety, of which this other Ex-
" ternal, was only a ſhadow. For, e-
" ven as Eternal good things lay cover-
" ed under the bark of Temporal good
" things; ſo alſo the Bodily-Religion
" preſcribed in the Law, was a Shadow
" and Type of Spiritual-Righteouſneſs,
" to be revealed more clearly in the
" Goſpel. In a word, the Law con-
" ſidered Carnally, and according to
" the Letter, neither required Spiritu-
" al-Righteouſneſs, nor promiſed Eter-
" nal-life; but being conſidered Spi-
" ritually, was the very Goſpel it ſelf,

" nei-

"neither doth the Apoſtle move any "controverſie about here it, being ſo "taken.

Pa. 232. He again largely tells us what Law it was, that the Apoſtle only meant when he excludes the Law, and Works of the Law, from Juſtification; where denying the Spirit to be given by that Law, he thus ſpeaketh.

"If by the Law, you underſtand the "Covenant made in Mount *Sinai*, and "given to the *Iſraelites*, *Moſes* being "the Mediator, which I have even "now ſaid, is the moſt proper and ge-"nuine Acceptation and Notion of it "in *Paul*'s Epiſtles, it is manifeſt it "contained no Promiſe of the Holy "Spirit. But in other Books of the "Old Teſtament, yea, and in the "writings of *Moſes*, though not in the "*Moſaic-Covenant* it ſelf; we may "find a Promiſe cleer enough, of gi-"ving the Grace of the Holy Spirit to "the *Iſraelites*, as that, *Deut.* 30. 6. "*The Lord thy God ſhall circumciſe thy* "*heart, and the heart of thy Seed, to* "*love the Lord thy God with all thy* "*heart*, &c. Now this cannot be

"done, as all that differ from *Pelagius* "confeſs, without a great force of the "Holy Ghoſt. But this did belong "to the Goſpel-Righteouſneſs, which "firſt *Moſes* himſelf, and after other "Prophets, did ſhew to lie under the "Bark of the external Rites and Ce-"remonies; for the Righteouſneſs "of Faith which is manifeſted in the "Goſpel, was in times paſt, teſtifi-"ed by the Law, and the Prophets, "as the Apoſtle expreſly affirms, "*Rom.* 3. 21. Yea, I will ſhew you "further, that this was part of the "New Teſtament promulgated by "*Moſes*. For, that the Covenant "made with the *Jews*, *Deut.* 29. and "30. in which theſe words are found, "was plainly diſtinct from the Cove-"nant made in Mount *Sinai*, and al-"ſo doth contain a Renewing of the "Covenant made with *Abraham*, "that is, of the Goſpel-covenant, "then more obſcurely Revealed, "may be Demonſtrated by many Ar-"guments.

"*Firſt*, It is expreſly ſaid, *Deut.* 29. 1. that

"that the words which there * follow, "were words of the "Covenant which "the Lord com- "manded *Moſes* to "make with the "Children of *Iſra-* "*rael*, in the Land "of *Moab*, beſides "the Covenant "which he made "with them in *Ho-* "*reb*. They weakly trifle, who here "underſtand * a renewing of the Co- "venant made in "Mount *Sinai*, and "do contradict the "moſt plain words "of the Text. Nei- "ther can the words "of the Covenant "made in Mount *Sinai*, repeated and "renewed, in any ſenſe, be called the "words of the Covenant, which God "made beſides that he had made in "*Sinai*.

* It is not ſaid, the words which follow] I rather think that the Expreſſion [theſe are the words of the covenant] meaning the laws or Precepts of the Covenant, hath reference to the Laws before recited in this Book of *Deuteronomy*, rather than to the words following in this Chapter; And that this Verſe, if a right diviſion had been made, ſhould rather have ended the former Chapter, than have begun this.

* Such an Interpretation is not ſo weak and trifling, but, had I no other evaſion, I would fly to it rather than affirm here, as this Author doth, a new Covenant on Gods part, having quite different Precepts, Promiſes and Threats.

"*Secondly*, It is expresly said, * that "this Covenant is "altogether the "same with that "which God made "and confirmed by "Oath, with the "*Israelites* Ance-

* It is only said, That he might be to them a God as he promised them, meaning from Mount *Sinai*; and also had sworn it before to *Abraham*, &c. as appears, *Lev.* 26. 45, 46. and from many other places, *Exod.* 19. 5, 6. *Deut.* 26. 15. 18, 19.

"stors, to wit, with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, "and *Jacob*, *v.* 12, 13. which Cove- "nant, was the very Gospel something "obscurely revealed, as *Paul* saith, "*Gal.* 3. 16, 17.

"*Thirdly*, *Paul* cites some words of "this Covenant, as "words of the * "Gospel-covenant, "which holds forth "the Righteousness "of Faith: see *Rom.* "10. 6. *&c.* com- "pared with *Deut.* "30. 11. I am not "ignorant, that some determine these "words, to be accommodated to the "Righteousness of Faith, only by way "allusion: But I cannot believe them, "since *Paul* manifestly alledges these words,

* So *Paul* doth cite these words, *Lev.* 26. 12. *I will walk among you, and will be your God, and you shall be my people* (which words were spoken at Mount *Sinai*, as appears by *v.* 46.) as a Gospel-promise, as indeed they were, 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. and begins the following Chapter thus, *Having these Promises, let us cleanse our selves*, &c.

"words, as the very words of the "Righteousness of Faith; that is, as "the very words of the Gospel-cove-"nant, in which this Righteousness is "revealed. And, that I may confess "the truth, I have always esteemed "these Allusions (to which some flie, "as to the holy *Asylum*, or Sanctuary "of their Ignorance) for the most part "to be nothing else, then manifest a-"buses of the Holy Scripture.

"*Fourthly*, All the things contain-"ed in this Covenant, do wonderful-"ly fit, or agree, to the Gospel.

1. "As for the Precepts, there are "only commanded "here, * things be-"longing to Man-"ners, and which "are in their own na-"ture Honest, there being no mention "here made of those Rites whereof the "whole Legal-covenant is almost full, "which being considered according to "the words, may seem childish; and "further, the whole obe-"dience which is here re-"quired, may be † refer-

* There are no particular Laws recited, not so much as the Ten Commandments, in these two chapters, which he will have to contain this whole Covenant.

† So may equally all Covenanted by the people, at Mount *Sinai*, or required of them by God.

"red to a ſincere and diligent endea-
"vour to obey God in all things,
"*Chap.* 30. 10. 16. 20.

2. "As for the Promiſes, God here
"promiſes full Remiſſion of all ſins
"upon Repentance, e-
"ven of the moſt ‖ hei-
"nous, *Cap.* 30. 1, 2, 3, 4.
"which favour was never
"granted in the Legal covenant; And
"further, the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt,
"whereby the hearts of men may be
"circumciſed, that they may love the
"Lord with all their hearts, and ſouls,
"is clearly promiſed, *v.* 6. How far
"is this from the uſual vein of *Moſes*
"writings.

‖ So he doth as fully from Mount *Sinai*, Lev. 26. 40, 41.

Fifthly, "That Covenant which
"*Jeremiah* foretold, *Jer.* 31. 31, 32.
"*&c.* was a Goſpel-covenant, as all
"Chriſtians grant, and the Author to
"the *Hebrews* expreſly teacheth, *Heb.*
"8. 8. Now all thoſe things which
"the Prophet foretels of that Cove-
"nant, do † exactly an-
"ſwer to this *Moabitiſh-*
"*covenant*. *Jeremiah*
"calls his Covenant, a
"new

† Alluſions being too much built on, may be illuſions.

" new Covenant, altogether different
" from that which God plighted with
" the Anceſtors of *Iſrael*, going out of
" *Egypt*; *Moſes* ſaith the ſame of the
" *Moabitiſh-covenant*: *Jeremiah* gives
" this cauſe why God would make a
" new Covenant, *viz.* becauſe they
" brake the Old, wanting Gods power-
" ful Grace; The ſame reaſon *Moſes*
" gives here, of making this new Co-
" venant, *Deut.* 29. 4. *Jeremiah*'s, pro-
" miſed circumciſion of heart; ſo this:
" That promiſed Remiſſion of ſins,
" *Jer.* 31. 34. So this, *Deut.* 30.
" 1, 2, *&c.* *Jeremiah* ſpeaks of the
" clearneſs, and facility of the Pre-
" cepts, which are contained in the
" New-covenant, that they might know
" and obey them, without much ſearch
" and labour: So doth *Moſes*, *Deut.*
" 30. 11, 12. compared with *Romans*,
" 10. 6. All theſe things ſeem very
" clear to me. I have dwelt ſomething
" long upon theſe things; Both that it
" may be manifeſt hence, that all things
" in the *Moſaic-writings*, do not be-
" long to the *Moſaic-Covenant* proper-
" ly ſo called; And to ſhew how neceſ-
" ſary

"ſary it is to reſtrain the old Law, pro-
"perly ſo called, only to the Covenant
"made in Mount *Sinai*. And alſo,
"chiefly that the Wiſdom of God
"might appear, in diſpencing the Co-
"venant of Grace. God had made
"that gracious Covenant with *Abra-*
"*ham*, many years before the giving
"of the Law, to which Covenant, it
"afterwards pleaſed him to add another
"Covenant, made up of many painful
"Rites and Ceremonies; by which he
"might keep in their Duty; that is, re-
"ſtrain from the Idolatrous-worſhip of
"the Heathen, the rude and carnal po-
"ſterity of *Abraham*, lately brought out
"of *Ægypt*; and ſo, too much addi-
"cted to Paganiſh Rites, and Superſti-
"tions. But the moſt wiſe God fore-
"ſeeing, that this People of a fooliſh,
"or hard-heart (*obtuſi pectoris*) would
"not underſtand his purpoſe; after he
"had made this carnal Law, He com-
"manded *Moſes*, that he ſhould *pro-*
"*mulgate* a New-covenant to the *Iſra-*
"*elites*, or rather, that he ſhould re-
"new that Old-covenant, which he ma-
"ny years before had made with *Abra-*
"*ham*,

"*ham*, which did chiefly require ſpiri-
"tual Righteouſneſs, and was full of
"Grace and Mercy. That from hence
"the *Jews* might know, that the *Abra-*
"*hamatical-covenant* was yet in force,
"even after the Ritual-Law was made;
"and alſo was to be accounted for the
"Covenant, by which only their Salva-
"tion was to be attained, ſee *Gal.*3.17.
"Who would not here cry out with the
"Apoſtle? *O the depth of the Riches,*
"*and Wiſdom, and Knowledg of God*!

Since this here recited, hath ſome dark ſhew of proof, I ſhall before I go any further, manifeſt that the Author is notoriouſly miſtaken, in affirming that the Covenant made in the Land of *Moab*, was not the ſame for ſubſtance, repeated with that made at *Horeb*, or Mount *Sinai*; but a Covenant having quite different Promiſes, and Precepts, the one carnal and earthly, the other Spiritual and Heavenly; and alſo in thinking that theſe two Chapters, 29*th.* and 30*th.* comprehended the whole Covenant made in the Land of *Moab*. Let theſe things be conſidered.

A Covenant in the ſtricteſt propriety of the Word, is a mutual Engagement

of

of Parties, two at the leaſt. If one ſide promiſe, his part is not a Covenant, except both do. So that, that tranſaction between God and the people at *Sinai*, was properly a Covenant, *Exod.* 19. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. though God had not yet told the People what Laws he would require Obedience to in particular, for *Moſes* come's with a meſſage to the people from God, and tells them, that if they will obey his Voice, and keep his Covenant, *i. e.* his Law, they ſhould be a peculiar Treaſure unto him, and a Kingdom of Prieſts; that is, *He would be their God to bleſs them, if they would be his people to obey him.* This was Gods Promiſe in this Covenant; the people give this anſwer unanimouſly, *We conſent, we will obey God in all his Commands, be they what they will, though they were not told yet what his Commands ſhould be.* But this, though a Covenant, was but in order to the great Solemnization of this Covenant, which was, *Exod.* 24. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Where having given the Moral-Law, the Ten Commandments, and ſome Judicial and Ceremonial Laws; *Moſes* comes down

down from God, and relates them to the people. And the people anſwered, All that the Lord hath ſpoken, *We will do*; meaning, all that he hath, or ſhall ſpeak; for the addition of new commands, did not make ſo many New-covenants. Well, Now God hath promiſed on his part to be their God, if they will obey his Law. *Moſes* writeth theſe Laws that are rehearſed in the 20, 21, 22, 23, chapters, and conſecrateth ſome young men to offer Sacrifice (for *Aaron* and his Sons were not ſeparated, till the year after) He made the people confirm their Covenant by Sacrifices, as we do by Sacraments; He read the Book of the Covenant, that is, the Book comprehending the Laws fore-mentioned, and he ſprinkles the Blood of the Sacrifices on the people, and ſaith, *Behold the Blood of the Covenant which God hath made with you, concerning all theſe Words, that is, all theſe Commands.* Thus the word is uſed moſt properly of ſuch a Tranſaction, God hath engaged himſelf to bleſs them, if they would ſerve him; and they have engaged themſelves to ſerve him.

Some-

of Parties, two at the leaſt. If one ſide promiſe, his part is not a Covenant, except both do. So that, that tranſaction between God and the people at *Sinai*, was properly a Covenant, *Exod.* 19. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. though God had not yet told the People what Laws he would require Obedience to in particular, for *Moſes* come's with a meſſage to the people from God, and tells them, that if they will obey his Voice, and keep his Covenant, *i. e.* his Law, they ſhould be a peculiar Treaſure unto him, and a Kingdom of Prieſts; that is, *He would be their God to bleſs them, if they would be his people to obey him.* This was Gods Promiſe in this Covenant; the people give this anſwer unanimouſly, *We conſent, we will obey God in all his Commands, be they what they will, though they were not told yet what his Commands ſhould be.* But this, though a Covenant, was but in order to the great Solemnization of this Covenant, which was, *Exod.* 24. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Where having given the Moral-Law, the Ten Commandments, and ſome Judicial and Ceremonial Laws; *Moſes* comes down

down from God, and relates them to the people. And the people anſwered, All that the Lord hath ſpoken, *We will do*; meaning, all that he hath, or ſhall ſpeak; for the addition of new commands, did not make ſo many New-covenants. Well, Now God hath promiſed on his part to be their God, if they will obey his Law. *Moſes* writeth theſe Laws that are rehearſed in the 20, 21, 22, 23, chapters, and conſecrateth ſome young men to offer Sacrifice (for *Aaron* and his Sons were not ſeparated, till the year after) He made the people confirm their Covenant by Sacrifices, as we do by Sacraments; He read the Book of the Covenant, that is, the Book comprehending the Laws fore-mentioned, and he ſprinkles the Blood of the Sacrifices on the people, and ſaith, *Behold the Blood of the Covenant which God hath made with you, concerning all theſe Words, that is, all theſe Commands.* Thus the word is uſed moſt properly of ſuch a Tranſaction, God hath engaged himſelf to bleſs them, if they would ſerve him; and they have engaged themſelves to ſerve him.

Some-

Sometimes the word Covenant, is uſed for the Promiſe of one of the Parties only, as Gods conditional Promiſes, that if we will in ſincerity Love, Serve, and Obey him, he will be our God to bleſs us. This is not a Covenant in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, but a conditional Promiſe; yet is ſo called frequently in Scripture, becauſe it is Gods part of the Covenant, yea, all God's part of the Covenant of Grace, and all that he Seals or Promiſes; and when we do in ſincerity promiſe our part, theſe together make it actually a Covenant; He engaged actually to bleſs us, and we to ſerve him. Yea, if we promiſe only hypocritically, yet we are engaged ſo as we are guilty of Covenant-breaking; though God is not engaged by his conditional Promiſe, we not being real in performing the condition.

So our promiſing, engaging to obey, may be called our Covenant, becauſe it is our part of the Covenant; and all required of us, is, ſo to engage, and be real in it.

But moſt frequently in Scripture, the Laws of God, the Precepts themſelves are

are called the Covenant; being the Laws that God hath made Promiſes to the obedience of, and that the people by their engagement are bound to obſerve, *Deut.* 4. 13. Sometimes the word is uſed in other ſenſes, as for an abſolute Promiſe, as that of deſtroying the World no more with a Flood; but theſe ſignifications before named, are all that I ſhall have occaſion to make uſe of.

Now to make it appear, that the Promiſes and Precepts, of the Covenant made in Mount *Sinai*, and the Land of *Moab* were the ſame; Conſider,

This Book of *Deuteronomium*, ſignifying the ſecond Law, is ſo called, as all agree; becauſe it contains a repetition of the Laws formerly promulgated, almoſt all of them were made at Mount *Sinai*, above thirty nine years before this *Deuteronomium* (this Repetition of the Law) was Spoken, or Written. The occaſion of which Repetition of the Law (which may well be called, the Prophet *Moſes*'s Fare-wel Sermon) was as follows: That actual

Cove-

Covenanting that was made at Mount *Sinai*, or *Horeb*, was in the first year, yea, within two months after they came out of *Ægypt*, *Exod.* 19. 1. And all the people that were Twenty years old at their numbering, which was in the second year after their coming out of *Egypt*, are now dead, for their murmuring, except *Caleb*, and *Joshuah*, and *Moses*; and so there was great need to cause this new Generation of people, to enter actually into Covenant, to keep Gods Laws, which *Joshuah* caused them to do again after, at less than half that distance of time.

The appointed time of the end of the forty years, drew near, for the peoples entering the good Land, and *Moses* must not bring them thither, nor enter himself.

Now *Moses*, well knowing all these things, and that his departure was at hand, for he died within a Month after his beginning this Repetition of the Law to the people; for he began it the first day of the Eleventh Month, in the Fortieth year, and died in the end of that Month, for the people mourned

for

for him Thirty dayes, *viz.* the whole Month after, *Deut.* 1. 3. and *Chap.* 34. 8. compared. I say *Moses* foreknowing this, and earnestly desiring to tye the people (that he was about to leave) fast to God, and his Laws; he begins, in the hearing of the people, in the Land of *Moab*, a Month before he died (*Deut.* 1. 3. 5.) to take an effectual course, to inform them in the knowledg of God's Laws, and to engage them to Obedience, by reciting, and Summing up the Transactions of God, towards them in the Wilderness, and all the Laws Moral, Judicial, and Ceremonial (yet leaving out for the most part, those Judicial and Ceremonial commands, that concerned the Priests Office, or were not of ordinary Practice) and adds some commands, especially concerning things to be done by them, when they come into the Promised Land: And affectionately exhorts them to obey these commands, with all their Heart and Soul, ever and anon intermixing discourses of the Blessings would come on them by their obedience; and Miseries by disobedi-

ence. This is the Sum of his Diſcourſe to this, *Chap.* 29. He that ſhall think, that all the Promiſes, and Threats in this Book hitherto, do only *mundum ſonare*, are only Temporal; ſure a vail is upon his Eyes, and Heart, in reading the Old Teſtament. And then, in this *Chap.* 29. Having thus far prepared them to do what they do knowingly, and affectionately, He engages them in a Covenant (even with an Oath which was more than was done in *Sinai*) to keep all theſe Laws. He begins his Prologue to this actual Engagement, as at *Sinai*, with theſe words, [*You have ſeen*] *v.* 2. *v.* 9. keep therefore the words of this Covenant (that is, the commands that I have repeated unto you) that you may proſper in all that you do, *v.* 10. You ſtand here this day all of you, before the Lord your God, your Captains, your Elders, your little Ones, your Wives, that you ſhould enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his Oath which the Lord maketh with thee this day; that he may Eſtabliſh thee to day, for a people to himſelf; that He may be unto thee

thee a God, as he hath ſworn unto thy Fathers, *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, *i. e.* to give their Seed this good Land. And tells them, If they forſake God, and God bring on this Land the curſe of the Covenant, written in the Book of this Law, and make it like *Sodom*, and *Gomorrah*; and men ſhall ſay, What means the heat of this great Anger? It ſhall be anſwered, *Becauſe they have forſaken the Covenant of the Lord God of their Fathers, which He made with their Fathers, when he brought them out of the Land of* Egypt (that is, which he made almoſt Forty years ſince with the Fathers of this Generation at *Sinai*) *v.* 21, 25. And He ſpends the next *Chapter*, (which the Author makes part of his New-covenant) partly in telling them God would, when caſt out of their Land for their ſins, yet, admit them again to it, if they repent and turn, as He told them before; alſo (what ever this Author ſaith of that admitting no Repentance) as you may ſee apparent, *Lev.* 26. 40, 41, 44, 45, 46. Yea, this place of *Leviticus*, which is ſaid expreſly to be ſpoken at *Sinai*,

v. 64. is rather more expreſs for Repentance, being accepted, than this the Author ſo much inſiſts on. And partly in telling them, that he hath told them plainly, what the Laws of God are, which if they obſerve they ſhall live, and need not go beyond the Sea, to enquire what they may do to be happy; and partly in warning them to keep theſe Laws.

The whole contents of this Book of *Deuteronomy*, to the end of this Thirtieth *Chapter*, was not only ſpoken to the people within a Month before his Death, which is apparent; but it is very probable, within a few of the firſt days of the Month, the latter part of the Month being taken up, with his writing it, *Chap.* 31. 9. And giving a charge to the Prieſts and *Levites*, and in his preſenting himſelf with *Joſhuah*, before the Lord in the Tabernacle, that God might give *Joſhuah* a charge, *Chap.* 31. 9, 10, 14, 15. and in Speaking and Writing the Song, called *Moſes Song*, and teaching the people it, *v.* 22. And in bleſſing the people, *Chap.* 33.

And obſerve, This *Deuteronomy*, this Fare-

Fare-well Speach of *Moſes*, all of it (however to the *29th. Chapter*) was when *Moſes* had written it, given to the Prieſts with a command that it ſhould be Read, in the hearing of the people met together, every Seventh year, as being very ſutably Pen'd for their Inſtruction, *Chap.* 31. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. And it is commanded, that when they ſhould have a King, that he ſhall in the beginning of his Reign, Write out a Copy of this Book, *Chap.* 17. 18. The laſt *Chapter* of this Book, was added by ſome other than *Moſes*, as is apparent; It's likely by *Joſhuah*. You ſee now, there is no colour to pretend, that the Covenant ſpoken of, *Deut.* 29. 1. means only that *Chapter*, and the following; much leſs that theſe Two *Chapters* only of all *Moſes* writings, have only Spiritual commands, and Spiritual promiſes; and give way and make Promiſes to Repentance. For, as for the Spirituality of the Laws in this *Chapter*, it doth not Recite the Laws they were here engaged to obey, not ſo much as the Ten Commandments, whereof ſome are ſure Spiritual commands, and

the ſincere obſerving of them, is certainly the condition of the Goſpel, but ſhew plainly, This Covenant obliges them to keep all the Laws given at Mount *Sinai*. And for the Promiſes, and Threatnings, they are expreſſed in as Terrene Expreſſions here, as in moſt other places. And as for this of Repentance, ſee *Lev.* 26. 40. When they ſhall be in Ages to come, almoſt deſtroyed with Judgments threatned for their ſins; if they ſhall confeſs their Iniquities, and the Iniquities of their Fathers, *v.* 41. And if their uncircumciſed heart be humbled, and they then accept the puniſhment of their Iniquities; *I will not caſt them away, but will remember their Land*, v.45. *I will, for their ſakes, remember the Covenant of their Anceſtors, whom I brought forth out of the Land of* Egypt, (that is, This at *Sinai*, for none other of their Anceſtors were brought out of the Land of *Egypt*) *v.* 46. Theſe are the Statutes, and Judgments, and Laws which the Lord made between him and the children of *Iſrael*, in Mount *Sinai*. So *Deut.* 4. 29. If ye ſhall be ſcattered for

your

your ſins, amongſt the Heathen, being driven out of your own Land, and ſhall there ſerve other Gods of Wood and Stone; *If from thence thou ſhalt ſeek the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt find him, if thou ſeek him with all thy heart, and with all thy ſoul*, v. 31. *For the Lord thy God, is a merciful God*, Exod. 34. 6. He proclaimed himſelf thus from *Sinai*: *The Lord, the Lord, gracious and merciful, forgiving Iniquity, Tranſgreſſion, and Sin*, &c.

As for *Deuteronomy* 29. 1. [*Theſe are the words of the Covenant which the Lord commanded* Moſes, *to make with the Children of* Iſrael, *in the Land of* Moab, *beſide the Covenant which he made with them in* Horeb]. It ſeems apparent to me, that this *verſe* hath reference to the Laws, and Precepts before Recited by *Moſes*, in his paſt Oration to the people, and the meaning of the words is this: Theſe fore-Recited Commands, are the Laws which the people covenanted to keep; which covenanting of the people, the Lord commanded *Moſes* to require from them, in the Land of *Moab*, beſide

that covenanting, which *Moſes* required from the people in *Horeb*. Which I will make plain, in Reciting theſe words again, with the ſenſe they are uſed in, in other Scriptures.

Theſe are the words (that is the Laws or Precepts, for ſo words is uſed apparently, *v.* 9. and 2 *Kings* 23. 3. *Deut.* 27. 26. *Exod.* 24. 28. So alſo the Ten Commandments, are called the Ten-words, *Deut.* 4. 13. and *Chap.* 10. 4. And, the Words, (*Exod.* 20. 1.) of the Covenant (By Covenant is here meant, the peoples promiſe to obey, the peoples actual Engagement; ſo the word Covenant is uſed, 2 *Kings* 12. 17. and *Chap.* 23. 3. and 2 *Chro.* 15. 12.) which (that is, which Covenant, which actual Promiſe, not which words, for that the *Hebrew* word כרת uſed appropriately for making a Covenant, will by no means bear; So that it is an apparent Errour in the *Septuagint* to read ἅτινα, refering to λόγους The mean-

ing

ing is, * which actual promiſe of the people) the Lord commanded *Moſes* to make with the children of *Iſrael*; (that is, which the Lord commanded *Moſes*, to cauſe the children of *Iſrael* to make; for ſo this phraſe and word is expreſly uſed, *Joſh.* 24.25. *Joſhuah* made a Covenant with the people that day, that is, cauſed the people to promiſe obedience to the Lords Commands that day: The like ſenſe the word hath, ſo far as concerns the Covenanting of the people, (2 *Kings* 11.17.) in the Land of *Moab*, beſide the Covenant (that is, beſide their actual promiſing) which *Moſes* made with them (that is, cauſed them to make) at *Horeb*, or *Sinai*.

* I had written this before Mr. *Pool's Elabuitate*, and uſeful *Synopſis*, was publiſhed; and upon reading the *Criticks*, and ſome others, could find none concurring with me, but now in his Book, I find *Piſcator* interpreting the words [beſide the Covenant] thus, *Præter actionem illam quæ fœdus fuit factum*, which can mean nothing but the peoples Engagement.

But ſuppoſe this *Verſe* ſhould have reference only to the following *Verſes*, in this *Chapter* and the following; his meaning can only be, Theſe are the words whereby he engaged the people in a Cove-

Covenant, distinct from the words whereby *Moses* engaged them in a Covenant to the Lord formerly. We find *Joshuah*, a little before his death, again engaging the people in a Covenant, to obey Gods Commandments; and useth Words and Exhortations, different from these in this *Chapter*, in engaging them. Suppose we had read such words as these, *viz. These are the words of the Covenant, which* Joshuah *made with the people, besides the Covenant which* Moses *made with them at Mount* Sinai, *and in the Land of* Moab. This might import, that it was a distinct Engaging of the people, from the other two; but not that it was another Covenant of God, having other Promises, and Commands, and Threats. We find the people in *Nehemiah*'s time, *Nehem.*10.29. entering into a Covenant; But, it was into the Mount *Sinai-Covenant*; It was to walk in God's Law, which was given by *Moses*, and we may see there, it was also to observe Ceremonial and Judicial commands. It seems they had not observed this New-covenant of this Authors, in these

theſe two *Chapters* of *Deuteronomy*.

Object. *But may not this whole Book of* Deuteronomy, *being ſpoken in the Land of* Moab, *comprehend a new Goſpel-Covenant, diſtinct from the Old at* Sinai, *and ſo that be ſerviceable to reconcile thoſe paſſages of the Apoſtle* Paul *in diſpute, the Author's way.*

Anſw. No: For the Apoſtle *Paul* cites, (*Gal.* 3.) two Paſſages out of this Book, for words of the Law.

And again, There are, by far, more Promiſes and Threatnings in this Book, expreſſed in a Carnal Temporal and Terrene ſtile, than in all the Law of *Moſes* beſide in *Exodus*, *Leviti.* *Numb.*

I am ſenſible, this *Ignis fatuus*, hath led me out of my deſigned way; for I deſigned here, only to bring in thoſe Paſſages together, (without any reflection upon them) where the Author tells us, what he ſuppoſes the Apoſtle *Paul* means by the Law, which he diſputes againſt Juſtification by, and by the Works of; even a Law, that either hath, or at leaſt in the ſenſe the Apoſtle oppoſeth Juſtification by it, hath neither Spiritual-promiſes, nor

Threa-

Threatnings, nor Precepts. There is only one place more, and that is (*pag.* 122,123.) where he explains the Apostle's meaning by the Law; but because I have been long in Reciting these, and that will methodically be brought in, in another place, I shall bring it in there, and so shall return now to the place where I left off, *viz.* At the end of *pag.* 102. and shall begin at the top of *pag.* 103. where he tells us, The Apostle useth two Arguments against Justification by Works; which two Arguments this Author only prosecutes, and so largely, that the Setting down, and Proving, and Explaining these, takes up almost two third parts of his whole Book: Take his own words.

"*Pag* 103. The Arguments where-
"by *Paul* opposes the Law, may be di-
"vided into two sorts; one into those
"which belong to the whole *Mosaic-*
"*Covenant*; the other, into those Ar-
"guments, which chiefly respect the
"Ceremonial Law.

This latter sort of Arguments, which chiefly respect the Ceremonial-Law, he leaves till near the end of his Book,

and

and then ſpends but few Lines about them, as not being (as he ſaith) controverted by Chriſtians.

"The Arguments of this firſt ſort, "whereby the Apoſtle fights, are eſpe- "cially two; and thoſe are taken from "a double defect of the *Moſaic-Cove-* "*nant*, *viz.* From the want both of "pardoning Grace, and of helping "Grace.

"The firſt Argument of the Apoſtle "reſpecting the *Moſaic-Covenant*, is "drawn from the defect of Pardoning- "grace, or Remiſſion of ſins, which "that Covenant wanted: Where the "Apoſtle ſhews the Univerſal guilt, as "well of the *Jews*, as of the *Gentiles*; "and that all are guilty of thoſe ſins, "that there is no true and perfect Re- "miſſion to be hoped for by this Law. "It is clear, that this is the ſcope of "*Paul*, in the third *Chapter* of the Epi- "ſtle to the *Romans*. For there, af- "ter a long Catalogue of ſins, char- "ged both on the *Jews*, and *Gentiles*, "by the Law, *v.* 10. *&c.* At length, "*ver.* 20. he inferrs this concluſion, "*Wherefore by the works of the Law,*

"*ſhall*

"*ſhall no fleſh be juſtified in his ſight*, "viz. *in the ſight of God.* And alſo, "the things which the Apoſtle diſputes "in the 3*d. Chap.* of *Gal.* are to be "referred the ſame way; where he "proves alſo by this Reaſon, That all "who are under the Law, are under a "Curſe; becauſe it is written, *Curſed "is every one, that ſhall not continue in "all things written in the Law, to do "them*, v. 10.

"But here I am ſenſible, that upon "the very Threſhold, I am caſt upon a "great difficulty. For it may be "doubted here, whether this Argu-"mentation of the Apoſtle, doth not "lean upon this Foundation; that he "determines, The *Moſaic-Law*, as it "was given to the *Jews*, was a Law "requiring Obedience wholly perfect, "and ſo impoſſible to be performed; "and alſo, whether the Apoſtle con-"clude, that upon this account, all men "are ſinners by this Law, and by, and "for their ſins, guilty of eternal Death, "and Malediction; and ſo, that no "man can be Juſtified by this Law. "Thus indeed the moſt think, affirm-

"ing

"ing that the Law "of *Moſes* did ob- "lige (if not ab- "ſolutely, yet † "conditionally, "*viz.* unleſs they "fled to the Goſ- "pel-covenant) all "thoſe to whom it "belonged, and "that under the "peril of Eternal "death, to moſt ab- "ſolute obedience, "that is, ſuch as "comprehends all "maſner of ſinleſ- "neſs; yea, and "that perpetually, "and did forbid all "Imperfection, In- "advertency, and Infirmity through "the whole courſe of their lives. But "I cannot be perſwaded to the opinion "of theſe, for Reaſons which I ſhall "preſently give. In the mean while, "that you may more rightly underſtand "the ſtate of this Controverſie; keep "this

†Conditionally is no good word here; For though we may properly ſay, Men ſhall periſh for their ſins conditionally, except they repent, for this is no more than to ſay, the Law that threatens death abſolutely, ſhall be executed except they repent; yet we muſt not ſay, that the Law threatens death conditionally except they repent; but we muſt hold it threatens death abſolutely repent or repent not, and that the Goſpel is a diſtinct Law, a Remedying-Law. For if God threatned death by the Law, only conditionally, except they perform the Goſpel-condition, it would follow that no man is pardoned that performs the Goſpel condition, it would alſo quite deſtroy Chriſts Satisfaction. Though I know many mean well that uſe ſuch ſpeeches, and however far better than the Author, that denies any ſuch Law-threat, either abſolute or conditional.

"this exactly in your mind, that these
"two things do widely differ, *viz.*
"A man to be accounted by
"God, unworthy of the reward of
"Righteousness and Eternal life: And
"a man to be accounted of God, wor-
"thy to be punished with the punish-
"ment of Eternal death. For the first,
"For a man to be judged unworthy of
"Eternal Life, it sufficeth that he is
"not altogether Sinless; for God may,
"and that righteously, deny him the
"reward of Eternal Life for the least
"Imperfection. For God might de-
"ny that infinite Gift of Eternal Life
"to a man obeying perfectly, if such
"a one could be found; because it is a
"free Gift, and cannot be due to the
"Merit of any Creature: But for that
"last, That one should be accounted
"by God, worthy of the punishment
"of Eternal death, it is necessarily re-
"quired, that he did not perform that
"Obedience which he could perform.
"Hence it follows, that no man can
"righteously be adjudged guilty of E-
"ternal death, for the defect of perfect
"Righteousness, since this Righteous-

"ness

"neſs is ſimply impoſſible to a man in "this Life. And it is manifeſt, that "the Apoſtle in the Diſpute of which "we ſpeak, doth prove all *Jews*, and "*Gentiles*, without difference, for not "obeying the Law, not only to be un- "worthy of the reward of Eternal life, "but obnoxious to Divine anger, and "Eternal death, *That every mouth "might be ſtopped*, Rom. 3. 19. that "is, that all *Jews* and *Gentiles*, may "be without excuſe, *Rom.* 1. 20. and "2.1. And what is more unlikely (that "I may uſe here, the words of *Epiſco- "pius*) that the Apoſtle would charge "men to be guilty of Death and Con- "demnation, for violating, or not keep- "ing a Law which he judged it impoſ- "ſible for them to keep: Neither is "it likely, that *Paul* had any Adver- "ſaries but what would grant, that no "man could keep the Law ſo exactly, "as not to offend in the leaſt, and ſo "no man to be juſtified in that ſenſe by "the Law; And who would not alſo "object to him, that men were ill "accuſed to be guilty of Pun- "iſhment, when it is certain, they

"could not avoid the fault. The foun-
"dation of all here said, is this, That
"it is repugnant to Divine Justice, that
"any should be bound to Impossibili-
Pag. 105. "ties, especially under the peril of
"Eternal death.

He here make's out, That, that-usu-al pretence of some, is very absurd, that men have lost their power to do what God requires of them, and so God may justly require what they can-not now do; which I grant, and have elsewhere proved to be so absurd, as no way to answer that difficulty. He thus proceeds,

"And to come to the *Mosaic-Law*,
"it is far more unlikely, that it was a
"Law requiring perfect Obedience.
"Which that I may make manifest, It
"is diligently to be observed, that the
"Old Law (as *Grotius de Satisf. cap.*
"10. noteth) may
"be considered *
"two ways, as ha-
"ving a double
"relation, or σχέσει. *First*, Carnally,
"and according to the Letter, as it was
"an Instrument of the Government of
the

* This Enumeration is not near large enough, nor any thing to the purpose.

"the Jewiſh Polity, or the Common-
"wealth. *Secondly*, Spiritually, as ha-
"ving a ſhadow of good things to come,
"*Heb.* 10. 1. Now in this laſt σχέσις,
"or Habitude, ſince the Law was no-
"thing elſe but the
"* Goſpel it ſelf,
"ſhadowed with, or
"ſhadowed under
"Types; no man
"in his right wits,
"will ſay, it was a
"a Law, requiring
"perfect obedience, *viz.* In that ſenſe
"wherein the Law was meant in this
"Controverſie, to require perfect O-
"bedience.

* The Law, as it had a ſhadow of good things to come, was not the Goſpel it ſelf: Again, ſo far as it was an Inſtrument of the Jewiſh Polity, it was a ſhadow of good things to come: And ſo far as it was the Law of Grace, the Goſpel of Salvation, it Typified nothing.

"It remains therefore to be affirmed,
"that the Law of *Moſes* required per-
"fect Obedience under the former
"conſideration [*viz.* As the Inſtru-
"ment of the Jewiſh Government.]

"But to affirm
"this, would be
"wonderfully * ab-
"ſurd. Becauſe,

† It did threaten death in this conſideration, to the leaſt failing in this Political-Law.

"*Firſt*, Becauſe we read expreſly,

"that God by *that
"Law, command-
"ed Sacrifices by
"which the offen-
"ces, which were not done in contempt
"of the Law, and with a high Hand
"were expiated, as may be seen, *Num.*
"15. from the 22*d.* to the 29*th. v.*

* It was not by that Law formally considered, but by the Remedying Law different from it.

"Now * where a-
"ny pardon of ſin
"is granted, there
"the requiring of
"Perfect-bedience cannot have place:
"For theſe are inconſiſtent.

* The juſt contrary is true. For there can be no pardon of the want of perfect obedience, but where perfect obedience is required.

"*Secondly*, The *Moſaic-Law*, was
"ſo far from requiring Perfect-obedi-
"ence from the *Jews*, that it is too
"manifeſt, that ſome things were in
"that Law * per-
"mitted to them
"for the hardneſs
"of their hearts,
"which things can-
"not be excuſed from being ſin, as
"*Polygamy*, and Licence of divor-
"cing for leight cauſes, *Deut.* 24. 1.
"and compared with *Mat.* 19. 3. *&c.*
"I conclude therefore, that ſince by
"the

* The doing things permitted by a Law, is no breach of that particular Law, nor hinders a man from perfectly obeying that Law.

"the *Mosaic-Law*, carnally considered, "many sins were remitted to the *Jews*, "and some things (which at least to us "Christians, are accounted sins) were "expressly permitted; It ought to be "granted without controversie, that "this Law, so considered, did by no "means require perfect and exact "Obedience.

"Yet there are not wanting Argu- "ments, by which some endeavour to "prove this *Hypothesis* to be true; and "that thence, *Paul* gathered the im- "possibility of Justification by the *Mo- "saic-Law*. We will weigh these Ar- "guments exactly, to try if they have "any thing of Solidity, which ought "to prejudice so plain a truth: They "bring two chiefly.

"Their first Argument, is taken "from that place fore-alledg'd by me, Pag. 108. "*viz. Gal.* 3. 10. *As many as are of "the works of the Law, are under a "Curse:* For it is written, *Cursed is e- "very one, that doth not continue in all "things*, &c. Where, say they, it is "manifest, that the Apostle gathers "the Impossibility of Justification by

"the *Moſaic-Law*, from thence that by "this Law, no man is free from a "Curſe, who hath not obeyed all the "commands of this Law perfectly.

"I anſwer, It is not neceſſary, nor "convenient, in the cited place this "phraſe [*continue in all things*] ſhould "ſignifie moſt Perfect-obedience, or "quite ſinleſneſs; ſince ſuch Obedi-"ence is impoſſible to man encompaſ-"ſed with Fleſh; neither doth it ſeem "conſentaneous to Divine equity, that "any one for the defect of it, ſhould "be obnoxious to Eternal Maledicti-"on. Therefore the ſenſe of the Te-"ſtemony cited, is this; That every "man is Accurſed; that is, is Execra-"ble and Obnoxious to the Puniſh-"ment threatned by the Law, who doth "not do, and ob-"ſerve perſevering-"ly * all thoſe "things which the "Law preſcribeth to be obſerved. And "he is reputed to do all things, who "doth not err from the end of the "Law; who keeps ſafe the eſſen-"al parts of the Law, or (as others "ſpeak)

* Is not this perfect obedience to a Law, to do all the Law requires to be done?

"ſpeak) who keeps all thoſe Precepts "of the Law, which contain the ſub- "ſtance of Life; of which ſort are all "thoſe Commands which are expreſ- "ſed by *Moſes*, in the Curſes, *Deut.* "27. In a word, who admits nothing "into himſelf knowingly, and witting- "ly againſt the Law of God, although "he fails in ſomething, either out of "Ignorance, or Inadvertency.

"That place, *Jam.* 2. 10. being "Twin-brother to this, gives great light "to this place, *Whoſoever keeps the* "*whole Law, and yet offends in one point,* "*is guilty of all:* That is, is obnoxi- "ous to the Puniſhment threatned to "the Tranſgreſſors of the Law, *v.*10. "*For he that ſaid, Do not commit Adul-* "*tery, ſaid alſo, Do not kill,* &c.

Here he giveth the true and ordinary Interpretation of this place ſo largely, as to take up *pag.* 109. and half *pag.* 110. which is this, He that knowingly allows himſelf in the knowing Tranſgreſſion of any one Law, is as far from Salvation, as if he kept none; for ſuch a one doth not act ſincerely in Obedience to any Law, ſince all Divine Laws

have the ſame Author and Authority: Therefore he that knowingly neglects one Law, doth not keep other Laws, becauſe of Gods Authority in Commanding, or becauſe of Gods Command, but becauſe he hath not that liſt through Temptation to break them; for if he had as much liſt through Temptation to break them, ſuch a one would break the other Laws. He goes on:

"But one may perhaps reply. Grant
Pag. 11c. "it, let that place of *James* be ſo ex-
"pounded, yet the ſame Interpretati-
"on will by no means agree to the A-
"poſtle's ſcope in that place of the Epi-
"ſtle to the *Galatians*: For ſince the
"Apoſtle doth prove all who are of
"the Law, to be under a Curſe, only
"by this reaſon, becauſe it is written,
"*Curſed is every one, that doth not con-*
"*tinue in all things*, &c. he doth mani-
"feſtly hint, that no man can continue
"in all things, or that the Law doth
"require ſuch perfect obedience, as
"none can perform.

"Anſwer, I altogether deny that to
"be hinted, or implyed in the Apoſtle's
"Argument: Which, that it may be

'made

"made apparent, I will reduce it to a "*Syllogiſtical* form: Thus,

"*He is accurſed who doth not continue in all thing, which the Law commands.* But whoſoever are of the "works of the Law, do not continue "in all thoſe things:

"*Ergo*, They that are of the works "of the Law, are under a Curſe.

"The Apoſtle ſpeaks expreſly of Pag 111. "thoſe who are of the works of the "Law, *v.* 10. That is, who ſeek Righte-"ouſneſs in the Law being ignorant of, "or deſpiſing the Grace of the Goſpel, "whom he oppoſeth to them that are "of Faith, *v.* 9 That is, who believe "the Goſpel and embrace it's Grace; "and who have attained the Promiſes "(or thing Promiſed) of the Spirit, "whereby they may fulfil the Righte-"ouſneſs of the Law, and ſo avoid the "Curſe of it, *v.* 14. Of the firſt ſort "indeed he hints, "that they neither "continue, nor † "can continue in "all things writ-"ten; but of the ſecond ſort, he by

† Then they are not, according to his Argument, bound to continue in all, &c. and ſo are free from the Curſe, though they continue not in all, &c.

"no

"no means affirms it. In a word, The
"Apoſtle never ſpoke word againſt
"man's being able to fulfil the Law, in
"all things by Goſpel-Grace, ſo far as
"it was a Law; that is, under the pe-
"nalty of Eternal death, is impoſed us,
"or ever was impoſed upon Mankind,
"ſince the fall of the firſt man; yea,
"he often acknowledges this poſſibili-
"ty, as we ſhall ſee hereafter.

"There remains another Argument
"of the Adverſaries (of which they
"boaſt, as being moſt unconquerable)
"taken out of that famous place, *Deut.*
"*6. 5. Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy*
"*God with all thy heart, and with all*
"*thy ſoul, and with all thy ſtrength.*
"You may ſee here, ſay they, that the
"higheſt and perfecteſt love of God,
"is required of all in the Law.

"Anſwer, They who fight with this
"Argument, do kill themſelves with
"their own Sword. For, ſince God re-
"quires no other love, than what is done
"with all the Heart and Mind, and with
"all the Strength; it is manifeſt, that
"nothing is required of us beſide, or
"above our ſtrength (our ſtrength, I
"mean,

"mean, helpt with that measure of "Grace which God communicates to "every one of us in this Life, or is cer- "tainly ready to communicate.) Now "it is certain, that we can with all our "strength obey "God, because it "would be a † ma- "nifest contradicti- "on, to say we can- "not do the thing "we can do (or "cannot do a thing "according to our "strength.) Pag. 112.

† It is no contradiction, but a great truth. It is apparent, that a man's culpable Impotency to good, is an Impotency of doing something, that we have the natural power and strength to do; And whosoever doth not understand this, must necessarily talk ridiculously about such matters as these in hand.

"The truth of this Answer, is esta- "blished firmly with these following "Reasons. *First*, Because God pro- "mises that he will give to his people, "that which he requires, *viz.* To cir- "cumcise their heart, to love him with "all their heart, *Deut.* 30. 6. *Second-* "*ly*, Because God himself witnesseth, "that there were some that loved him "after this manner; so it is said of "*Asah* the King, and all the people, "that they sought the Lord with their "whole heart, 2 *Chro.* 15. 2. We read

"of

"of *David*, that he followed God with "all his heart, 1 *Kings* 14. 8. But "that is a famous Teſtimony, which "the Holy Ghoſt gives concerning *Jo-* "*ſiah* the King, That he turned to the "the Lord with all his heart, and with "all his ſoul, and with all his ſtrength, "according to the Law of *Moſes*, 2 *Kin.* "23. 25. *viz.* That is ſaid to be done "with the whole heart, and whole "ſtrength, which a man imploys his chief "Thoughts and Endeavours about; "even as we ſay, A man is *totus in li-* "*teris*, wholly in ſtudies that maketh "them his chief buſineſs.

I ſhall as ſoon as I have recited all he ſaith of this nature, anſwer the ſubſtance of all; But this of loving God with all the Soul, being ſomething out of the Road, I will anſwer it here. The command of loving God with all the Heart, and Soul, and Strength, muſt be conſidered either ſtrictly (as I ſaid at the beginning) as a Law with it's penalty; And ſo it requires the utmoſt of a mans natural Ability (and no more, not as much as an Angel's ability reaches to) ſo that if he fails in the leaſt degree of this

this, he fails ſo much of love due to God by this Law, and is under its curſe. It is eſſential to a Law, as a Law, that it require perfect Obedience to it ſelf; and to deny this, would be to deny that every Law requires all that it doth require; any thing ſhort of this, is not all the Law requires. If a man do not love God in as high a degree as this law in this ſenſe requires, he is from under its Bleſſing, and under its Curſe and Condemnation, and cannot poſſibly be Juſtified by this Law in this ſenſe, nor be pardoned by it; for no Law can poſſibly pardon an offence againſt it ſelf. But he may be pardoned by another Law, a Law of Grace. In this ſtrict ſenſe no meer man in this life, not *Joſiah* himſelf, ever loved God with his whole heart ſo highly as he ought, ſo high as the Law in this ſenſe required; however, me thinks, he ſhould not have pretended it of all the people of *Iſrael* in *Aſa*'s time, but have ſought ſome other ſenſe at leaſt for thoſe words, and that might have brought him to the ſenſe I ſhall now ſpeak of.

Secondly, Theſe words may be conſider-

ſidered as the condition of the Remedying-Law made with them for the Merit of Chriſt, then to come; as taken with this Goſpel lenity, that if they love God with the prevailing bent of their Souls, or above all other things, they ſhall be pardoned, eſcape the curſe of the Law in its Rigour due. And in this ſenſe, a man loves God with all his Heart, and Soul, as far as God by his Remedying-Law, requires for his Salvation, and ſo obeys the Law taken in this ſenſe perfectly; that is, loves him ſo much as it requires, as neceſſary to his Salvation; that doth it thus prevailingly, though he fail in the degrees, he ought to love God by the ſtrict Law, and ſo needs pardon. The meaning is not, that *Aſa* loved God as much as any Law required from him, and ſo needed no pardon, or Chriſt's ſatisfaction, for failing in any degree of love due to, or required by God.

But to proceed with the next words of the Author.

Pag. 112. "I will add this for a Concluſion to "this Diſpute; This my Opinion of "the poſſibility of fulfilling the Law,

"ſo

"so far as it ever was imposed by God,
"upon men as a Law, is not a new up-
"start Opinion, but an Opinion appro-
"ved by the common Vote of all the
"Antients, who wrote before the *Pela-*
"*gian* Controversie had muddied the
"Rivulets of the more pure and pri-
"mitive Doctrine. Yea, and *Austine*
"himself, though otherwise too hot in
"this unhappy Controversie, did not
"doubt to confess, that God command-
"ed possible things; and, in this sense,
"only what all particular Believers are
"able to fulfil. Here he cites some Antients for this Opinion, that God doth not require what men have no power to do; which takes up *pag.* 112, 113, & 114. almost. Pag. 112, &c.

I grant, it is apparent they did hold, as I also do, that God requires no more than men have the Natural power to do. But yet I dare challenge any to name one, accounted no Heretick, that held this Opinion (that follows by evident consequence from the Authors Opinion): That every man (for that follows by consequence,) or that every man by that measure of Grace which God

God communicates to him, or is ready to communicate to him, may for any Impotency in him to the contrary, ſo live as not to fail in any thing the Law requires, ſo far as to ſtand in need of pardon, or Chriſts ſatisfaction for ſuch failings. Yea, or this Opinion which he expreſly holds, as you will preſently ſee more fully, *viz.* That after the receiving of the Goſpel, or Converſion, men may, for any Impotency on them to the contrary, ſo live as not to ſin at all, as not to fail at all in obedience to the Law; or ſo, as not to do any thing that deſerves, or is by any Law threatned with Eternal death.

He goes on.

Pag. 114. "From the things which we have "already ſpoken, I ſuppoſe it to appear "plain enough: That the Law of *Moſes* did not require moſt perfect Obe- "dience, that is, all manner of ſinleſs- "neſs in the higheſt degree, under the "peril of Eternal death, and ſo that "the Apoſtle's Argument is not built "upon that Suppoſition. It remains, "that we conſider, by what Reaſon the "Apoſtle proves his Concluſion.

"There-

"Therefore I judg (ſaving honour to "better judgments) this Argumentati- "on of the Apoſtle, to lean upon two "foundations chiefly.

"*Firſt*, That all, both *Jews* and "*Gentiles*, were guilty of hainous ſins, "and ſo obnoxious to Judgment, and "Divine anger; this is hinted con- "cerning the *Jews* chiefly, and alſo of "all who did ſeek Righteouſneſs in the "Law (as I ſaid before, in my anſwer "to the firſt Objection) in that place, *Gal.* 3. 10. But the ſame is largely de- "monſtrated of all without difference, "*Rom.* 3. Where he charges many hai- "nous ſins, both upon the *Jews*, and "*Gentiles*. But that the Context of the "whole place may be rightly under- "ſtood, two things are chiefly to be "noted, one belonging to the Accuſa- "tion, another to the Perſons Accu- "ſed.

"*Firſt*, As for the Accuſation it ſelf, "it is to be Noted, that it is not of a- "ny kind of ſins, but they are accuſed "of ſins more properly ſo called; that "is, of hainous ſins, and worthy of "Eternal death. This is clearly ma-

"niſeſt; First, out of the words by "which the Poſition, [or Affirmation] "of the Apoſtle (which was proved in "the former *Chapter*, and is in this "*Chapter* further Demonſtrated) is ex- "preſſed, *v.* 9. We have before pro- "ved, that both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, are "all under ſin. Where that Phraſe "[*to be under ſin*] manifeſtly ſignifies "to be under the dominion of ſin, or "to be addicted to hainous ſins; whoſo- "ever is ſuch a one, is ſaid by the Apo- "ſtle, to be ſold under ſin, *Chap.* 7. "14. Secondly, It is apparent out of "the whole Context of the Apoſtle, "in which all the ſins that are enume- "rated, are of a more * hainous ſort, as "will eaſily appear to any one, viewing "the place.

* The Apoſtle indeed doth inſtance in hainous ſins, and ſo the import of his Argument, *Rom. Chap.* 1,2,3. ſeems this, *viz.* If ſo be that ſins ſcarce to be named, were to be found frequently, almoſt univerſally polluting even thoſe learned *Gentiles*, *Chap.* 1. 22. that excelled all other *Gentiles* in knowledg, where the ſtudy of Divine and humane Knowledg abounded, and were great Profeſſors of Wiſdom; And if amongſt the *Jews*, even in the beſt times, the days of *David*, horrid wickedneſſes were to be found very frequent, ſo that even in a manner, the whole body of the people were guilty of ſuch hainous ſins; it may be well and facilly gathered, that all are ſinners, and cannot be juſtified by the Law, that is, without pardon of ſin.

"*Secondly*,

"*Secondly*, If you enquire concern-
"ing the Perſons charged by him, they
"are as well *Gentiles*, as *Jews*, *v. 9.*
"19. 23. but both conſidered as they
"were before, and without the Grace
"of the Goſpel, which is even mani-
"feſt from the ſcope of the Apoſtle,
"whoſe purpoſe it was to ſtir up both
"*Jews* and *Gentiles*, convinc't of their
"guilt and miſery, to ſeek and em-
"brace the Grace of the Goſpel. There-
"fore *Paul* contends, that both *Gen-*
"*tiles* and *Jews* conſidered in this e-
"ſtate, to be all under ſin. You will
"Object, But there were ſome, at
"leaſt amongſt the *Jews*, who liv'd a
"holy and unblamable life, before the
"Faith of Chriſt [or, their faith in
"Chriſt] and a life moſt alien from
"the Vices which the Apoſtle here
"reckons up, and from all of the like
"kind; ſuch as were *Zachary*, *Eli-*
"*zabeth*, *Simeon*, *Anna*, and o-
"thers.

"I anſwer: I confeſs it; yea, I do
"not doubt, but amongſt the *Gentiles*

† I dare not affirm this: For then I muſt hold their Salvation, whereas I read, Salvation is of the *Jews*; and that the *Gentiles* were without hope, without God in the world. Neither yet dare I ſay, that none did thus ſincerely.

† "alſo there were "ſome who abhor- "red the Vices "here mentioned, "and alſo did ſin- "cerely, and from "their hearts, love "and follow (*Coluerunt*) Virtue and "Righteouſneſs, ſo far as it was known "to them: And both right Reaſon, and "St. *Paul* himſelf perſwades me to be "of this Opinion, who doth not ob- "ſcurely teach it himſelf, *Rom.* 2. *v.* "14, 15, 26, 27. But becauſe the "Objection is made only concerning "the *Jews*, I will anſwer only con- "cerning them, leaving it yet to the "Reader, to accommodate or fit the "ſame Anſwer to the *Gentiles* (*muta- "tis mutandis*) changing what is to be "changed.

"I ſay therefore, that *Firſt*, Theſe "Pious men amongſt the *Jews* "were very few, and, being compar'd "to others, as a drop in the Sea; "and therefore the Apoſtle was to take "no great notice concerning them: "But it was reaſonable, that the great

"ſcarci-

"ſcarcity of good men ſhould (as one "ſpeaks) give its teſtimony to the nu- "meroſity of the wicked. And cer- "tainly, univerſal ſpeeches of this ſort "that the Apoſtle here uſes, do often "occurr in Scripture; which yet it is "certain, are † *Hyperbolical*, ſee *John* "3. 32. *Iſa.* 66. 23. *Joel* 2. 28. *Acts* "2. 17. *Pſal.* 14. 23. & 145. 14, 15. "*Phil.* 2. 21. *&c.*

† That is, all put for the moſt. This then is to ſay, that the moſt men are guilty of ſins deſerving Eternal death, and needing pardon by Chriſt; but he contradicts this ſence after.

"*Secondly*, Thoſe few that were "Righteous under the Law, did not "receive their Righteouſneſs from the "Law, but they owed it to Goſpel- "grace, which even before the Pro- "mulgation of the Goſpel, did (indeed "more ſparingly and rarely) put forth "it's force through all paſt-Ages. In "a word, they were led with the Spi- "rit of the Goſpel, and not of the Law, "and ſo deſerved to be accounted with "thoſe who are not of the Works of "the Law, but are of Faith. Whence "the Author of the Epiſtle to the *He-*

"*brews*, shews that all the works of "Pious men, who shine in the History "of the Old Testament, proceeded "not from the Law, but from Faith.

"*Thirdly*, It is † "likely that those "few did not so "carry themselves "through the whole "course of their lives, but that they "some time fell into some sins, or into "some more hainous sin, and worthy "of death; Yea, this is to be account-"ed for certain; † "because it is ex-"presly read con-"cerning those ve-"ry men to whom "in the Old Testa-"ment, an unbla-"mable and perfect observation of the "Divine Law, is ascribed; That some-"times they fell into some sins, and "those enormous ones, and most wor-"thy of Death, as of *Asa*, 2 *Chron.* "16. Of *David*, 1 *Kings* 15. 5. Of "*Josiah*, 2 *Chron.* 35. 22. And I "think, that which follows with the "Apo-

† Sure this is too easie a word, that it is likely such did commit such a sin, as to deserve Eternal death, so as to need Christ, and Pardon.

† This doth not prove his Opinion, for though these did not, yet it is probable, Some did live without any hainous sin, in his sense, in the whole course of their lives, and so did not need pardon as to Eternal guilt, by his opinion.

"Apoſtle, *v.* 23. muſt be interpreted
"to this ſenſe, *viz.* All have ſinned
"and come ſhort of the Glory of God.
"That propoſition ſeems plainly Uni-
"verſal, ſo as to except none; imply-
"ing there is no man who hath not been
"guilty of ſome ſins, or of ſome more
"hainous ſin; either ſome one time,
"or for ſome time [*Sive aliquando,
"ſive aliquandiu.*] And this ſeems to
"be that very thing which the Scrip-
"ture in many places aſſerts; as for
"Example, 1 *Kings* 8. 46. *For there
"is no man who doth not ſin*, 1 John
"1. 8. *If we ſay we have no ſin, we deceive
"our ſelves, and the Truth is not in us.*
"Which ſpeech, that it ought to be
"underſtood of ſins properly ſo called;
"not only of lighter faults, and alſo
"that it is Univerſal, the very matter
"ſhews, and the things which are after Pag. 118.
"added in that Epiſtle. *Chap.* 2. *v.* 12.
"wherein alſo that is to be noted, that
"St. *John* ſpeaks in the *Præter-tenſe*;
"If we ſay we have not ſinned, *viz.*
"before the knowledg of the Goſpel;
"that is to ſay, The holy Apoſtle,
"would have the Chriſtians to whom

"he writes, diligently to take heed to
"themſelves, of the fault of an in-
"grateful mind; And that they would
"not attribute this, that they are pur-
"ged from Vices, either to them-
"ſelves, or the Law of *Moſes* or Na-
"ture, but only to Goſpel-grace. O-
"therwiſe, he doth not ſeem to deny,
"but that after the knowledg of the
"Goſpel, and its Grace received, ſome
"could be without ſin; ſo as the word
"Sin is taken by him, not ſo as it
"ſhould ſignifie meer Ignorance, or
"ſuddain Motions; but thoſe evil acts,
"which have *(tractum)* a continued
"courſe (as *Grotius* ſpeaks) and do not
"go before deliberation; yea, he doth
"not obſcurely hint that this is poſſible,
"1 *Epiſt.* 2. 1. Where he doth ſeri-
"ouſly exhort Chriſtians not to ſin.
"Perhaps, one may reply, that the A-
"poſtle in the aforeſaid *Chapter*, *v.* 3.
"doth uſe the *Preſent tenſe*. *If we ſay,*
"*we have no ſin*, &c. Therefore he
"implies, That no man even after the
"Faith of the Goſpel, is free, or can
"be free from thoſe ſins more properly
"ſo called. But the anſwer is eaſie,

"for,

"for, to have ſin, and to ſin, or to do "ſin, do not ſignifie the ſame. Be- "cauſe to have ſin (as *Grotius* ſaith "rightly) is not now to be in ſin, but "to be guilty, or to be made guilty for "ſins formerly committed, as doth "moſt manifeſtly appear from *John* "9. 41. and 15. 22, 24. The ſenſe "therefore is; If we ſay that we have "not hainouſly ſinned before the know- "ledg of the Goſpel, and, becauſe of "thoſe ſins, to have been guilty of Eter- "nal death, and ſo yet to be guilty, un- "leſs the Grace and Mercy of the Goſ- "pel ſhould Relieve us, we are plainly "Lyars, and baſely ingrateful toward "the Goſpel, and that Truth which we "profeſs. What need of many words? "*John* himſelf is a manifeſt * Interpre- "ter of himſelf; when afterwards he

* Why may not both Speeches be true? Or why may not

the latter Speech as well be Expounded by the former? I could ſhew that theſe words were ſpoken againſt ſuch as pretended Perfection, and that *Grotius*'s interpretation is not right; but that would require too many words. It is a ſhorter way to refer you to other Scriptures, ſpeaking in the *Preſent tenſe*, *Jam.* 3. 2. *In many things, we offend all.* He puts himſelf into the number, and ſaith not we have offended, *Eccleſ.* 7. 20. *There is not a juſt man upon the Earth, that doth good, and ſinneth not.* 1 Kings 8.46. *There is no man that ſins not.* If it ſhould be replyed, Such are not properly ſins, I ſhall ere long anſwer that.

Expounds

" Expounds, not by, we ſin in the *Præ-*
" *ſent tenſe*, but, we have ſinned in
" the *Præter tenſe*, that which before
" he had ſaid, *viz. We have no ſin.*
" But let us return to *Paul.*

" It appears from what we have ſpo-
" ken, that this is the Sum of the firſt
" *Hypotheſis*, the Apoſtle's Argument
" leans on, *viz.* That both *Jews* and
" *Gentiles*, if you conſider the far
" greateſt part of them, were plainly
Pag. 119. " under the dominion of ſin, enſlaved
" to moſt filthy Vices. And they who
" were the beſt, and moſt holy of ei-
" ther Nation, had not ſo ordered their
" life, but at ſome time they had faln
" into ſome ſins, or at leaſt into ſome
" † one, more hainous ſin and worthy of
" death. And ſo all, both *Jews* and
" *Gentiles*, without difference, and
" without acception, were guilty be-
" fore God, *Rom.* 3.19. were obnoxi-
" ous to Divine wrath, and Eter-
" nal death. Thus he, *verbatim.*

† But they all according to his great Argument could have lived without all theſe ſins. or without that grievous ſin worthy of Death, and conſequently, ſo as to have no need of Pardon, or Chriſts death, to free them from Eternal death, elſe no Law could require them to live free from ſach ſin; and conſequently would be guiltleſs in committing that Act, and not need pardon for it, and conſequently not need pardon, or Chriſts death at all.

His

His great Argument againſt the ordinary Interpretation of the words of the Apoſtle *Paul*, *viz.* That no Law of God requires any more than a man can do (which I grant to be true, but not in his ſenſe) in the ſenſe that he uſeth, it will do ſtrange feats. By the ſame Argument that he proves, that God doth not require his people to be free from their dayly failings (*viz.* Becauſe no man cloathed with fleſh, can live without ſuch) he may prove that any man for any Impotency on him to the contrary, may be free from ſtanding in need of Pardon, or the Blood of Chriſt: thus.

Whoſoever can live free from any great ſins, deſerving or threatned with Eternal death, can live without need of pardon, or Chriſts ſatisfaction:

But all men can live free from any great ſins, deſerving or threatned with Eternal death. *Ergo.* The conſequence is apparent: He may prove his *Minor* thus. If there was any man that could not live without any great ſin threatned with Eternal death, then he is not bound, no Law requires him, to live without ſuch ſin: But,

But, the Law of God requires him to live without ſuch ſin: *Ergo.* Yea: And he might produce *Aquinas*, and others affirming, that though a man may live a little while without Venial-ſin, though yet not long; yet he may live without Mortal ſin, all his life. Yea this Argument will as well prove, the Heathen may live perfect and without ſin, as any elſe. If they do what they can do, they may live without ſin: But they can do, what they can do. And it is a contradiction (he ſaith) to ſay otherwiſe. The conſequence he may prove ſtill thus: *That no Law requires any man to do more than he can.*

As for ſuch words [Properly ſins, Improperly ſins, Leſs properly ſins, ſins not deſerving Eternal death;] and then ſometime again, ſaying [no Law requires a man to live without them.] It is ſuch ſlippery Diſcourſe, off, and on; That I can but ask Queſtions, to have him clear his meaning in Anſwering; and ſuch Queſtions I would ask, a man ſpeaking obſcurely about Venial-ſins (amongſt which ſome reckon Fornication.) Are theſe, Things, or Entities (that

(that are conſiſtent with truth of Grace, or Sincerity, thoſe *peccata quotidiana incurſionis*, as they are commonly called) forbidden by any Law of God, or not? If you ſhall ſay, as *Lombard*, *Aquinas*, *Bellarmine*, that they are not, then they are not Tranſgreſſions of the Law, are not ſins at all, and no puniſhment whatſoever can be due to, or deſerved by them, being no faults, and a man is perfect notwithſtanding them. *Bellarmine* ſaith, *There is no way poſſible to maintain the Catholick Doctrine of mans ability, perfectly to keep the Law, but by denying Venial-ſins, to be forbidden by the Law.* Lib. 4. de Juſtif. Chap. 14.

Again, may a ſincere Chriſtian ſeriouſly ask Pardon for theſe ſins of dayly Incurſion? Then they are Sins, and Tranſgreſſions of a Law, or they could not be pardoned, neither could Chriſt be a Sacrifice for them; and then they are threatned with, and deſerve Eternal death; for a man cannot with underſtanding, ask pardon for that puniſhment which God cannot in Juſtice inflict. There can be no Pardon but of Grace,

Grace, and Mercy, and Favour, and whatsoever God doth of Grace and Favour, He might justly not have done it, and so might in strict Justice not have pardoned, but have condemned us for these.

Shall a man be condemned for these, except he repent of his other sins? *Aquinas* and *Bellarmine*, maintain that men should be punished with Eternal death, for their Venial-sins (that do not, they say, deserve death Eternal) except they repent. Then they do deserve Eternal death; for He may not so much as punish a man except he repent, for those things which do not deserve the Punishment; for he may not do unjustly, though men do not repent.

Will any say, though they be not *contra legem*, against the Law; yet they are *præter*, besides the Law, as many say concerning Venial-sins? I would only say, What do you mean? Do you mean that they are neither commanded to commit those sins of dayly Incursion, nor forbidden; then they are (as some say the Ceremonies are) meerly things indifferent.

If

If they be not meerly indifferent, will you ſay that the abſtaining from ſuch things is commendable, though not commanded? And ſo ſay, as this Author rightly tells us, the *Phariſaical Jews* held; that thoſe Commands that required Spiritual and inward Holineſs, as the Tenth Command, were not Commands, but Counſels. If ſo, then the abſtaining from ſuch Sins, is a work of Super-erogation; And then indeed, the failing in not doing works of Super-erogation cannot be pardoned, nor need Chriſts ſatisfaction.

It is but caſting a Miſt before the Readers Eyes, ſo often to put in the word Eternal-death; ſaying, they do not deſerve Eternal death. Will he grant that God may juſtly puniſh ſuch ſins with Temporal death, or any Temporal puniſhment? I ſee, he will not. His Opinion, and his and *Epiſcopius*'s Argument, that God cannot juſtly require what men cannot do; ar eas much againſt their deſerving any puniſhment at all. If God do not, as he affirms, require them by any Law to be free from ſuch ſins, then they are not ſins, nor

not deserve any Penalty. It would then be Injustice in God, to make any mans finger or tooth to ake for them. Whereas the Popish Schoolmen themselves do grant, that they do deserve Temporal punishment. Though the Scripture indeed allows no ground for any such distinction, but either threatens (and be sure it would not threaten what sin doth not deserve) death; yea, Eternal death or nothing. *The wages of Sin is death, the Sting of death is Sin, and the strength of Sin, the Law.* And, *Cursed is he that continues not in all*, &c. Which curse the Author (as you will after see) affirms, to signifie Eternal wrath.

But to go on with his words.

"The other thing which the Apo-
"stle supposes in his Argument, is this,
"*viz.* That there was no true and per-
"fect Remission of Sins, or deliver-
"ance from Divine Anger, or Eternal
"death due to sins, promised in the
"*Mosaic-Law.* It is manifest enough,
"the Apostle had respect to this, *ver.* the
"20*th.* of the foresaid *Chapter* (*viz.*
"*Rom.* 3.) Where having drawn his
"Conclusion only from the first *Hypo-*
"*thesis*,

"*theſis* (*viz.* that all are guilty) he "preſently ſubjoyns this other (with- "out which, his whole Argumentation "would have been infirm) in theſe "words; *For by the Law, is the know-* "*ledg of Sin.* Which ſentence, is, "without doubt, to "be underſtood "excluſively, thus, "By the Law is "only the * know- "ledg of ſin, and "not Remiſſion: "Now I ſaid ex- "preſly, that the "Law of *Moſes* did "contain no true "and perfect Re- "miſſion of ſins. "Becauſe I well "knew that there "was given in the "Law of *Moſes* ſome kind of Pardon, "ſuch a ſlender one as it was, to Sins; "and that to voluntary and hainous "ſins. For though the Sins which "were done by Pride, notorious Re- "bellion; or, as the Scripture ſpeaks,

* Methinks, This very place, *viz.* *Rom* 3. 20 (which this Author inſiſts on, to prove the Apoſtle, by the *Law*, meant a Law having only Temporal threats, and External commands) ſhould have convinced him; that he meant by it a Law that had Future threats and Internal commands, even the Law in the ſtrict Conſcience-ſenſe; ſince it is hard to imagine how there ſhould be much conviction or knowledg of ſin and its danger, by a Law, that had no Spiritual, or Internal commands, nor Future-life-threats: And the Apoſtle's Argument here is this, *viz.* We cannot be juſtified as innocent, by the Law that convinces us we are ſinners.

"with a high-hand, could be expiated
"with no Sacrifices, but were punished
"with death without Mercy or Pardon,
"except the special Mercy of God did
"intervene, as *Numb.* 15. 25, 26. is
"to be read: Yet, they are not all to
"be accounted amongst these sins (as
"the most Learned † *E-*
"*piscopius* hath most high-
"ly well observed) which
"are done voluntarily, or
"are done Spontaneously, or, in some
"measure, on purpose; but they only
"which are done with an impious con-
"tempt of Gods Commands, or with
"the stubbornness of a wilful mind.
"And so, they are They, to which the
"Punishment of Death was appointed
"by God. It is plain, that they that
"think otherwise, are in a manifest Er-
"rour; as appear's from that, that we
"see, God appointed sacrifice for such
"sins as these, *viz.* Not restoring a
"Pledg; The taking away something
"from another by Force; The denying
"of what one found of another's; yea,
"and that with an Oath, *Lev.* 6. 2, 3, 4.
"Therefore there was granted Remis-
"sion

† This is the common observation of Learned men.

"sion in the *Mosaic-Law*, to hainous "sins. But what a kind of Remission? "Why, External, Civil, Temporary, "and which belonged only to this Car- "nal life.

"For the Law, as it was an Instru- "ment ordained for the Political Beati- "tude of civil Society, did promise "long Life to those who lived ac- "cording to the Law, *Lev.* 18.5. and, "on the contrary, did threaten violent "death to the Transgressors of it, as "we learn out of *Exod.* 20.7.

"But the highest Law-giver, the "merciful GOD, that all the people "might not be exstirpated with the pun- "ishments of their sinning, appointed "that some most atrocious offences in- "deed (that did wage open war against "the Life, and civil Converse of men, "and this Political Theocracy, or Go- "vernment of God, for the defence of "which, the *Mosaical-Law* was insti- "tuted; such as Idolatry, Murther, "Adultery, *&c.*) should only be ex- "piated with death; But, Sacrifices "were slain for men unclean, or defi- "led with Sins less hainous. There-

"fore the Punishment of Temporary
"death, which the men deserved, was
"transferred upon a Beast. Therefore
"the *Mosaical* Sacrifices, did afford on-
"ly a Carnal Redemption, in as much
"as they did, by Divine appointment,
"free a man indeed from a violent and
"immature death; but they did afford
"no remedy against death it self. In a
"word, they did not afford such Remis-
"sion as is conjoyned with the giving
"of Eternal life: There being no men-
"tion, in the Law of *Moses*, nor Pro-
"mise, made of it.

"The divine Author to the Epistle
"to the *Hebrews*, had respect to this,
"*Chap.* 9. Where having spoken of
"the Sacrifices prescribed in the Law,
"He denies they could make the Sacri-
"ficer perfect according to Conscience,
"*v.* 8. that is, Free the man from In-
"ternal, and Eternal guilt of Sin, in
"the sight of God; but they availed
"only to the Purgation of the Flesh,
"*v.* 13. that is, That a man might be
"Externally freed from Punishment,
"and Corporal death.

Then he brings in these places, *Heb.*

Chap.

Chap. 7. 11. 19. *Chap.* 10. 1. Where it is affirmed, *The Law made nothing perfect*, and thus proceeds. "In which "place, by Perfection, he chiefly un- "derſtands Full and Perfect, that is E- "ternal, Abſolution, not only from "leighter faults, but from moſt hainous; "which he moſt deſervedly denies to "be afforded by the Law of *Moſes*. "It cannot but be manifeſt to him that "rightly underſtands theſe things, "wherefore it is that the Apoſtle de- "nies Juſtification to the Law, *viz.* "Not becauſe it requires perfect, and "ſo impoſſible Obedience as the condi- "tion of Juſtification, but rather becauſe "it grants no Juſtification at all (that is "conjoyned with the Donation of E- "ternal life) upon any condition what- "ſoever.

"Out of theſe Premiſes, therefore, "the Apoſtle at length draws his Con- "cluſion, *viz.* Neither *Jews* nor *Gen- "tiles* (which be comprehended under "theſe words, *no Fleſh*,) *can be juſti- "fied by the Law of* Moſes, [*in the ſight "of God*,] Chap. 3. 20. Which words "are added by way of Emphaſis, be-

"cauſe he was to grant ſome kind of "Juſtification by the Law, *viz.* [Be-"fore men, and ſuch as would ſtand a "man in ſtead for Temporal felicity "only, but not to obtain the Kingdom "of Heaven.]

"Therefore this whole Argumenta-"tion of the Apoſtle, may be compre-"hended in this *Syllogiſm.*

"No man can be juſtified by the "Law of *Moſes*, *in foro Dei*, in the "ſight of God, who is guilty of thoſe "Sins to which no Remiſſion, in the "ſight of God, is granted by this Law:

"But all (as well *Jews*, as *Gentiles*) "are guilty of thoſe Sins, to which no "Remiſſion in the ſight of God, is "granted by the Law of *Moſes*:

"Therefore no man (*Jew* nor *Gen-"tile*) can be juſtified by the Law of "*Moſes*, in the ſight of God.

I confeſs I am Puzled, and at a Loſs, where to begin here to anſwer this Diſcourſe, there are ſo many things to be Objected againſt this Argument: I will in ſhort mention ſome few.

Firſt,

First, Here is an Arguing *per saltum*, by a great Leap, by supposing things, according to this Authors way, impossible, *viz.* That all men are obliged to Eternal Condemnation for their sins; whereas there is no possibility of this: For if thus obliged, let it be asked, By what Law? Now there is no Law, according to him, either promising Future happiness upon Obedience, or threatning Future misery upon Disobedience, but only the Gospel it self. If it shall be replied, that all were obliged to Eternal punishment for their sins by the Gospel, by the Law of Grace, and Pardon revealed in former times amongst the *Jews* and *Heathens*: It is so absurd, that I shall speak no more to it than I have: Christ was sent to Redeem us from the Curse of the *Law*, and not of the Gospel.

Secondly, It is apparent, that the Apostle, in such places as this Author makes it his business to Reconcile to the Apostle *James*, speaks of Justification, so as to deny Justification by a Law that did promise Eternal life, and threaten Eternal death, and required inward and

ſpiritual Obedience; and therefore he did not ſpeak of the Jewiſh Common-wealth-Law. *By the deeds of the Law, ſhall no fleſh be juſtified in his ſight, For by the Law, is the knowledg of ſin.* He tells us, None can be juſtified by that Law, that Chriſt bore the Curſe of; ſurely then, that Law threatned Eternal death, elſe Chriſt had born, and freed from, only a Temporal Curſe. He ſpeaks of a Law that the Apoſtles eſtabliſhed, *Do we make void the Law by Faith, yea, we eſtabliſh the Law.* Surely they did not eſtabliſh this Common-wealth-Law. And ſaith, the Law is Spiritual, and did not by thoſe words, mean, the Goſpel is Spiritual; but oppoſes the Law, to the Goſpel.

Thirdly, But ſuppoſe all men guilty of Eternal death without any Law, and ſuppoſe the Apoſtle do ſpeak of the Jewiſh Common-wealth-Law; yet this Argument that he aſcribes to the Apoſtle, would be intolerably faulty, and inconcluſive.

For, ſuppoſe ſome, in Charity to the Author, ſhould think he meant, that the Apoſtle's ſuppoſition is this; That all men,

men, *Jews* and *Gentiles*, are guilty of ſuch ſins, as there was no temporal Remiſſion upon Sacrifice allowed to, by that Law; but all, guilty of them, were without mercy to be cut off by the Magiſtrate: Then this Suppoſition would be falſe; for, without doubt, there were many among the *Jews*, not guilty of ſuch ſins. And again, The Argument muſt mean only the denying of Temporal Juſtification; and the denying of Eternal here, would not be ſenſe, and is alſo againſt the Author's intention.

Or ſecondly, The meaning is, (which is apparently the Author's mind) All are guilty of ſuch Sins, as there is no Eternal Juſtification promiſed from, by this Law, becauſe it promiſes no Eternal Juſtification at all upon any termes whatſoever. And then, methinks, the Author being a Diſputant, might have had a ſtrong tentation to think, he could have told the Apoſtle how to prove his great deſign eaſier, even by leaving out, and without making uſe of one of the Hypotheſes, or Foundations of his Argument, which is this; That all are Sinners (and eſpecially ſince this Author finds

finds it ſuch a difficulty to maintain that all are Sinners, and deſerve Eternal wrath by ſome Law, that he could not maintain it if there ſhould be found, ſome man that never committed a very groſs ſin in all his life, and therefore ſuppoſes that every man hath committed one at leaſt.) And ſo by arguing thus: No man, be he guilty, or innocent, can be juſtified as to Conſcience, or as pertaining to Eternal life, or death, by a Law that neither promiſes Eternal life to the Obedient, or threatens Eternal death to the Diſobedient:

But the Law of *Moſes*, neither promiſed Eternal life to any man Obedient, nor threatned Eternal death to any Diſobedient:

Ergo. No man, Guilty or Innocent, can be juſtified as to Conſcience, or Eternal things, by the Law of *Moſes*.

The *Minor*, might according to the Author, thus be defended: It is true, there are, it may be, ſome Expreſſions in the *Moſaic-writings*, that command Spiritual obedience, and promiſe Eternal life upon Obedience, and threaten Eternal death for Sin: But

theſe

theſe are the Goſpel it ſelf, comprehended in *Moſes* Writings, and men might be, and were Juſtified as to Conſcience, by this. And that is not it, that is meant by the Law in theſe Diſputes, of denying Juſtification by the Law, but only the Jewiſh Common-wealth-Law.

And indeed, if this be true, that the Law the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, promiſed no Juſtification as to Eternal, or Future concerns, upon any terms whatſoever; the Argument would not only have run eaſier and better, without any mention of all being Sinners: But ſuch mention, in that caſe, would be vain and idle (yea and falſe, if given as a reaſon why they were not Juſtified by ſuch a Law as to Conſcience): For the Sinfulneſs of men, could not be in the leaſt any reaſon at all, why men are not Juſtified as to Future life, by a Law that promiſed no ſuch Juſtification if they had obeyed; But the Law's not promiſing it, is all the cauſe poſſible.

But to go on with the Author.

"Hence moreover the Apoſtle in-
"fer's, that the *Jews* and *Gentiles* ought
"to

"to flee to another Covenant of great-
"er Mercy, *viz.* that Covenant eſta-
"bliſhed in the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, in
which there is promiſed, not only Tem-
poral, but Eternal Redemption, and
"Salvation, *Heb.* 5. 9. and 9. 12. and
"a moſt full and perfect Remiſſion of
"all Sins, even the moſt hainous, con-
"joyned with the donation of Eternal
"life, to all thoſe who ſhall from Faith
"in Chriſt, repent heartily of thoſe
"ſins, and give up themſelves to God,
"and a holy Life. And here the A-
"poſtle doth urge that upon both *Gen-*
"*tiles* and *Jews*, which other-where
"he had ſeriouſly preſſed upon the
"*Jews* chiefly, in theſe words, *Acts*
"13. 38,39. *Be it known therefore un-*
"*to you Brethren, that by him there is*
"*is Preached to you the Remiſſion of*
"*ſins; And by him every one that be-*
"*lieves, ſhall be juſtified from all*
"*things, from which you could not be*
"*juſtified by the Law of* Moſes. Where
"the Apoſtle ſeems to affirm two
"things, *viz.* Not only, that Spiritual
"Remiſſion of Sins (which the Law
"granted not at all) was Preached

"through

"through Jeſus; But that every Be-
"liever ſhould be Juſtified by him from
"all ſins, from which no man could ſo
"much as carnally be Juſtified by the
"Law of *Moſes*. Hitherto, concern-
"ing the firſt Argument of the Apo-
"ſtle.

He might have ſaid, Hitherto of all that hath any ſhew, that he ſaith of the Apoſtle's meaning. And I will add hitherto, I have tranſlated him, ſince I begun with his Argument, almoſt at leaſt, *verbatim*; But in going forward, will bind my ſelf to do it no further, ſince this firſt Argument is all the Arguments he brings, that can with any fairneſs, be pretended to be the Apoſtle's Argument, to exclude Juſtification by the Law, and works of the Law. I will relate the ſubſtance of his other Arguments, which is all he pretends to be the Apoſtle's, and the relating and expatiating upon which, takes up the reſt of his Book almoſt wholly, I will alſo relate all ſuch Paſſages, as have any conſiderable ſhew, to ſupport his Expoſition of the Apoſtles words in ſuch places, as this Book is Written

to

to Reconcile to Saint *James*.

"The other Argument of the Apo-
"ſtle, which equally hath reſpect to
"the whole Law, whereby the Apo-
"ſtle clearly proves the Impoſſibility of
"Juſtification by the *Moſaic-Law*, is
"taken from another defect of this
"Covenant, from the defect of Help-
"ing, or Auxiliary Grace; even as the
"Old Law indulged no full and perfect
"pardon to paſt ſins, ſo neither did it
"ſupply ſufficient aid for the avoiding
"of Future ſins. The Apoſtle is much
"in this Argument, ſhewing the Law
"was very Infirm in it ſelf, and plain-
"ly deſtitute of ſtrength, whereby mi-
"ſerable men might be drawn from the
"dominion of ſin, and from an inve-
"terate Cuſtom of ſinning, to true
"and ſaving Righteouſneſs, or Holi-
"neſs.

Firſt, This Argument from a diſa-bility of the Law, to ſanctifie men (ſuppoſe it true, which is indeed true of the Law, as the Common-wealth-Law, but not when the Law is uſed in the ſenſe wherein it was the Goſpel, or Law of Grace; for then this Diſabili-

ty

ty can only be affirmed, at the moſt, comparatively to this clear Diſpenſation ſince Chriſt) and conſequently that Sanctification muſt be by ſome Grace and Favour of the Spirit; would by no means prove Juſtification to be of Goſpel Grace, or Favour, or by Pardon. For ſuppoſe that God ſhould by his Spirit, take ſome effectual courſe, to preſerve a man wholly free from ſin; this Sanctification of a man would be free, and of Grace, and Favour, but not his Juſtification; but that would be of Works, and the Law in the ſtricteſt ſenſe of it, ſo as not to be of the Goſpel, or of Mercy and Pardon. The Sanctification of the humane Nature of Chriſt, was of Grace and Favour, and by ſpecial Diſpenſation: but his Juſtification was of Debt by the Law, and of Juſtice in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, and not of Grace, or Mercy, or Pardon, or by Imputation of Righteouſneſs, to one unrighteous.

Secondly, The Apoſtle doth not anywhere, to my remembrance (though it may have a true meaning in a very remote ſenſe) much leſs in any of the places

places propounded to be reconciled to St. *James*, make use of this Argument: That Sanctification is of Grace and Mercy, therefore Justification is so, and not of Works, or Debt. So that whether it be a good Argument or no, it is not the Apostle's Argument.

Thirdly, The Author seems now in the prosecution of this Argument, not to keep Justification, or Sanctification, or the grace and favour of Justification, and Sanctification, distinct, as he hath done hitherto; one being the working a real change (I mean real in opposition to a Law, or relative change) in the Soul; and consisting in the favour of Converting a man: The other being a Law-Act, and consisting in acquitting, or absolving a man from an Accusation. He seems to forget that he had *pag.* 8, 9. well and convincingly confuted the Opinion of *Grotius*, who herein *Symbolizing* with the *Papists*, affirm's that the Apostle *Paul* by Justification, means not in a Law-sense absolution from sin, but Sanctification, or Purging from Vices; whereas there is not one

one place where the word, δικαιωθῆναι, to juſtifie, is uſed where it ſo ſignifies, except *Rev.* 22. 11. *He that is righteous,* δικαιωθήτω ἔτι, *let him be further juſtified ſtill*: And concerning this place, the Author ſaith it is probable, and it is alſo affirmed by *Grotius* himſelf, that it ſhould be there read, according to ſome antient Manuſcripts, δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι, *let him do righteouſneſs ſtill.* Now, as I ſaid, this Author ſeems to forget this in the whole proſecution of this Argument, as, for Example, when *pag.* 253. he will have the meaning of thoſe words [*Tit.* 3. *v.* 7. That being *juſtified freely by his Grace*] to be, that being *enabled* by the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, to do thoſe things to which Juſtification is promiſed: Which is, in effect, to ſay, being juſtified by the Grace of Sanctification; or, being juſtified by the gracious operation of the Holy Ghoſt in Sanctifying. Which alſo is an Interpretation alien from the meaning of thoſe words. The meaning whereof is, as may appear to any, peruſing the words foregoing; That, having the Goſpel-condition wrought in us, by the

operation of the Holy Ghoſt, being Regenerated, we might be juſtified by his Grace, that is, by his Grace in Pardoning; not by the gracious Operation of the Spirit in Sanctifying. For though the Grace and Favour of Sanctifying, be aſcribed frequently to the Spirit as it's peculiar operation, yet not the grace and favour of Juſtification; but is peculiarly aſcribed to God the Father, as Judg and Rector, being a Law-Act. *It is GOD that juſtifieth, who is he that condemneth?*

"The Law had a defect of ſtrength "to Sanctifie men: Why? Becauſe "it wanted External help, neceſſary to "work true Sanctification; and Inter-"nal help, neceſſary to work true San-"ctification. It wanted an External "help, neceſſary to work true Sancti-"fication, *viz.* it wanted a promiſe of "Eternal life, to encourage men to o-"bey it: It wanted an Internal help, "neceſſary to work Sanctification, be-"cauſe it wanted the Gift of the Holy "Ghoſt.

"*Firſt*, As to the firſt, It wanted "this External help, to work true San-"ctifi-

"ctification, in that the Promiſes, and "Threatnings of this Law, wherein the "ſtrength of every Law lies, were "only Temporal and Earthly, and men "might eaſily contemn theſe. Thoſe "Earthly good things, would not much "move the mind of an intelligent man. "Yea, the Law of *Moſes* upon that ac-"count, that it contained only Earthly "Promiſes and Threats, was in it's own "Nature apt to beget in men a baſe and "ſordid Temper; yea, a Temper "plainly alien from true Piety. The "chief parts of Piety, are the deny-"ing of ſelf, bearing the Croſs, dayly "Prayer, Meditation on the Life-to-"come, and a moderate and a ſober uſe "of the good things of this Life. But "how could it be that this Law, that "bound their minds only to Earthly "profits, and worldly delights, ſhould "work ſuch Piety in men? And hence "it cometh to paſs, that the Precepts "of this Law, were much a Kin to the "Promiſes of it, *viz.* Earthly.

He then brings-in Scripture, to prove this defect, but none of them out of places where the Apoſtle ſpeaks againſt

Juſtification by Works, and by the Law, but theſe two (which I cited before, to ſhew his meaning by the Law,) *Gal.* 3. 13. *The Law is not of Faith, but he that doth them, ſhall live in them:* And gives this as the meaning; The Law did not promiſe ſuch things, as that a man did need Faith, which is the evidence of things not ſeen, to believe them, *viz.* It promiſed only things of Senſe, not of Faith, *Gal.* 3. 21. *If there had been a Law which could have given life, verily Righteouſneſs ſhould have been by that Law.* And ſuppoſes the meaning to be, that the fault was in the Law, not in the Men; for if the Law had promiſed it, men would have attained Life by that Law. Whereas the very next words of the Apoſtle, are, *But the Scripture hath concluded all under ſin,* &c. implying, it was through ſin, and mens default they did not attain life by that Law; which could not be if the Law there ſpoken of, promiſed no ſuch thing to the Obedient.

And he after tells us, that in the ſenſe wherein the Law had any Spiritual commands, or Threatnings, or Promiſes

miſes of a Future life, it was *Ipſiſſimum Evangelium*, the very Goſpel it ſelf: And that the Apoſtle never made queſtion about it, taken in this ſenſe; which is in effect to ſay. That the Apoſtle never ſpoke againſt Juſtification by the Law in any ſenſe, wherein it threatned Eternal death, or promiſed Eternal life; Nor, in any ſenſe wherein mans ſins hinder his Juſtification by it: And alſo it is to ſay, that no man is, or ever was Condemned by the Law, as to Eternal condemnation, in any ſenſe wherein the Law is diſtinct from the Goſpel; And that Chriſt never ſatisfied for the breach of any Law different from the Goſpel, that threatned Future death; much leſs for the breach of any Law, that required Spiritual, or Internal obedience: And alſo, That no man is pardoned, by Chriſt and the Goſpel, the breach of any Law that threatned Future death. But I have already, even in the beginning of this Diſcourſe, ſhewed both the inevitableneſs, and abſurdity, of theſe Conſequences.

Yet becauſe many maintain this Opinion of the Author for ſubſtance,

viz. That the Promiſes, and Threats of the Law, were only Temporal and Earthly, and ſo could not work in men true Piety. As *Epiſcopius*, Doctor *Hammond*, Doctor *Taylor*, &c. Though in ſomething diſagreeing from this Author in the way of * their evading the difficulties their Opinions are cumbred with, and becauſe it is a growing Opinion, and ſeems to me very dangerous, I will here ſpeak largely againſt it.

* I confeſs Doctor *Taylor* ſeems not careful to evade difficulties at all, but ſeems peremptory in denying any but Temporal promiſes, till Chriſts time. *Unum Neceſ. pag.* 2. & 3.

Firſt, I grant, The Law of *Moſes* had no Spiritual commands (meaning by Spiritual, as this Author doth, obliging the inward man, the Thoughts, and Affections) nor Threats, or Promiſes, of Life-to-come Puniſhments or Rewards, as it was the Jewiſh Political-Law, or the Inſtrument of the Jewiſh Polity. But this cannot be meant by the Law in thoſe Paſſages in debate, to be reconciled to *James*: For it is apparent (and this Author grants it) that mens ſinfulneſs is given by the Apoſtle,

poſtle, as the cauſe, why men are excluded from Juſtification, as to Future life, by the Law: But mens ſinfulneſs, could be no cauſe why none were Juſtified as to Conſcience, and Future-life by the Law, in this Political ſenſe, ſince it would not have Juſtified any as to Conſcience, and Future-life, had they been altogether innocent.

Secondly, How notoriouſly contrary it is to *David*'s, and *Paul*'s expreſſions, concerning the Jewiſh Law, to deny, it had, in any ſenſe, Spiritual Commands, or Promiſes, or Threats of Life-to-come Reward or Puniſhment? *Pſal.* 1. 2. *The Godly man's delight, is in the Law of the Lord, and therein doth he meditate day and night.* Pſal. 19. 7. *The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the ſoul. The Teſtimony of the Lord is ſure, making wiſe the ſimple:* He meant not only *wiſe* for this world. *ver.* 8. *The Statutes of the Lord are right, rejoycing the heart. The Commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightning the eyes; True and Righteous altogether, more to be deſired than Gold* (whereas Gold was worth a Temporal

Inheritance in *Canaan*) *ſweeter than the Honey, and the Honey-comb. By them is thy ſervant warned, and in keeping them, there is great reward:* He means greater than this world can afford, or elſe it was not very great. Pſal. 119.18.20. *Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wonderous things out of thy Law. My ſoul breaketh for the longing it hath to thy Judgments at all times.* Ver. 111. *Thy Teſtimonies have I taken as a heritage for ever, for they are the rejoycing of my heart.* That theſe things were ſpoken of the Law of *Moſes*, is apparent; nothing elſe, that could pretend to the Name of the Law of God, being then written; And it is equally apparent, Theſe things could not be truly ſpoken of a Law that had neither Spiritual Precepts, nor Future Promiſes, or Rewards. And ſure, none will pretend that *David*'s working-Fancy, conceited ſuch things of the Law, as was not true of it; for then he would have been too blame: And alſo theſe phraſes, *David* ſaith, and, The Holy Ghoſt ſaith, are uſed as *Equipollent* terms, *Heb.* 3. 7. and *Chap.* 4. 7. compared, *Pſal* 16.

Thou

Thou wilt ſhew me the Path of Life; in thy Preſence, is fulneſs of Joy, and at thy right Hand, there are pleaſures for evermore. *David*, that thus ſpeaks, tell's us, He learned his Wiſdom and Underſtanding, from his Meditation on the Law. Further, leſt any ſhould conceit, that *David* was a man wonderfully panting after the Word, and delighted in the Law only, upon the account of worldly Promiſes, therein made to the Righteous; Let it be conſidered, that *Pſal.* 17. 14. he allows wicked men to have great things in this life, calling them, *Men of this world, which have their portion in this life, whoſe belly thou filleſt with hid treaſures, they are full of Children, and leave the reſidue of their ſubſtance to them.* In the following *Verſe*, he diſtinguiſheth himſelf from theſe, as appears by the Antitheſis, *ver.* 15. [*as for me*] ſaying, *As for me, I will behold thy Face in Righteouſneſs. I ſhall be ſatisfied, when I awake, with thy Likeneſs.* So Pſal. 49. 6. *They that truſt in their Wealth, and boaſt themſelves in the multitude of their Riches,* Ver. 14. *Death ſhall feed on them,*

them, &c. Then follows by way of Antitheſis, *ver.* 15. *But God will redeem my ſoul from the power of the grave, for he ſhall receive me.* The Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith, *The Law is Holy, Juſt, and Good. The Law is Spiritual, but I am Carnal.* Call's it the Commandment that was unto Life, and means Eternal life. *I delight in the Law of God, after the inward man.* How unlike are theſe Encomium's to the reviling Language, this Author gives to the whole *Moſaic*-Diſpenſation.

Thirdly, If the Promiſes, *&c.* were only Carnal, and Temporal, and ſo men could not poſſibly be drawn to true Piety by them; Then no man was bound to true Piety by that Law: For no man is bound to natural Impoſſibilities; Then it was not men's fault that they were not made truly Pious by that Law. For it is naturally neceſſary as a Foundation of true Religion, as to believe that God is; ſo to believe that He is a Rewarder after this life, of them that diligently ſeek him here.

Yea further, If the Law, as this Author ſaith, was apt in it's own Nature,

to

to beget in men a ſordid Temper, and Minds alien from true Piety; then the Jewiſh people were bound to have ſuch Tempers, and Minds alien from true Piety: And if the Law did bind mens minds to earthly Profits, and worldly Delights, they did well in ſuffering themſelves to be thus bound by it: For they ought to yield to God's Laws.

Fourthly, God would not have been angry with the people for not being wrought to true Piety by the Law: For they would have been fully excuſable.

Fifthly, No man would have been obliged to Future miſery, or wrath to come by that Law, that had no threatning of Future miſery; and alſo Chriſt never bare any Future-life curſe, or any thing by way of Satisfaction, as to a Future-life curſe; Nor could any be pardoned their Tranſgreſſions of the Law, as to Future puniſhment, when the Law threatned no Future puniſhment.

Sixthly, Theſe Threats, and Promiſes concerning a Future life, were at leaſt ſo plain, as that people might underſtand them; elſe what I have ſaid,

equal-

equally follows, *viz.* That no man was bound to true Piety by them, nor could be justly Condemned, for not being wrought to true Piety by them, for they would be in such a case excusable. No man is bound to know, what he hath a natural Impotency to the knowing of. None will say, God can justly be angry at, or condemn the *Heathen*, for not knowing, and understanding the Doctrine of Christ, that they had not the means naturally necessary to understand. Yea, the Law of God was so plain, that the simple, *Psal.* 19. (even plain ordinary people, that were no *Rabbies*) and young men, might, with such helps as God afforded them, understand it; else they, at least, had been excusable, and could not be condemned for not being truly Pious.

Seventhly, The *Jews* ordinarily did believe the Law, promised Future life, and threatned Future misery, as appears by all the old Jewish * Writings extant. Yea, the *Sadduces* were accounted

* Their *Talmud*, naming three sorts of men, that should have no portion in the World to come, numbreth them for one sort, that shall say; The Resurrection of the Dead, is not taught by the Law. In *Sanhed. Pereh. Helek.*

counted by them as *Hereticks*, or *Atheiſts*, that denied Future happineſs to the Obedient, and miſery to the Diſobedient. *Targum Onkelos*, on *Lev.* 18. 5. paraphraſeth the place thus. *If a man doth them, he ſhall live in them, with Eternal life.* Targum Jonathan, thus, *Which if a man do, he ſhall live with Eternal life, and his portion ſhall be with the Righteous. Search the Scriptures, therein you ſeek to have Eternal life*, Acts 24. 14, 15. I believe all things written in the Law, and the Prophets, and have hope toward God; which they themſelves allow, that there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the Dead, both of the Juſt, and Unjuſt. The *Sadduces* errour, in denying a Future life, was occaſioned (as Chriſt tells us) by their not underſtanding the Scriptures, meaning the Old Teſtament, then only written, *Mark* 12. 24. which could not be ſaid, if the Scriptures revealed no ſuch things.

Eighthly, The Law had promiſes of Future-life Happineſs. Let any tell me, What a promiſe of Future-life is, if this be not one, *viz.* A notification of

of Gods will, to make them happy after this life, that ſhall ſerve and obey Him. Now, it appears, That this was ſignified to them, *Pſal.* 31. 20. *How great is thy Goodneſs, which thou haſt laid up for them that fear thee!* 1 Tim. 4. 8. *Godlineſs hath the promiſe of this life, and of that to come.* Where is the Promiſe of this life, and that to come, to be found? It's apparent, he means in the Old Teſtament, *Tit.* 1. 2. *In hope of Eternal life, which God that cannot lye, promiſed, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, before ancient Times*, or many Ages ſince, or Long ſince; for ſo it ſhould be Tranſlated; ſince it is not reconcilable to Truth or Senſe, to ſpeak of Promiſes (though true of Decree) before the World began, *Epheſ.* 2. 12. It is ſaid of the *Gentiles*, aliens to the Common-wealth of *Iſrael*, that they were without hope (that is, of Future happineſs) being ſtrangers to the Covenants of Promiſe, which the *Jews* had. Which at leaſt implies, 1. That the *Jews* had promiſes of a Future-life-happineſs. 2. That they had clearer promiſes of a Future life, than the

Gentiles,

Gentiles. And 3. What they had more of this Hope, was to be aſcribed to the Covenant of Promiſe, revealed in the Old Teſtament, *Rom.* 9. 4. *The* Iſraelites *had the Covenants, the giving of the Law, the Service of God, and the Promiſes.* And elſe, What advantage had the *Jews*, in having the Oracles of God committed to them? And wherein did God do more for them, in giving them his Statutes, and Judgments, than for any other Nation? Many in the world, had greater Temporal Profits, and Pleaſures, than however, the moſt of the *Jews* in *Canaan.* *Luke* 16. 28. Where, to the Rich man in Hell, deſiring to have *Lazarus* ſent to his Brethren, to tell them of the Future miſery of the wicked, and the Future happineſs of the Obedient; it was anſwered, They have *Moſes* and the Prophets, let them hear them; and if they will not hear them, neither would they be perſwaded, if one ſhould riſe from the dead; which could not have been ſaid, if the Old Teſtament-Scriptures had revealed no ſuch things: Yea, they would have been excuſable

in

in not being moved with *Moſes*, and the Prophets, to ſeek Future-life, and to eſcape Future-death, if there was no ſuch thing revealed, ſo as they could underſtand it by the helps, that were Miniſtred to them, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Timothy* from a Child (by the help of his Mother, and Grand-Mother) underſtood the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament (ſo far, without doubt, as was neceſſary to Salvation, and then be ſure, ſo far as to know there was a Future reward promiſed to the Obedient) which were able to make him wiſe unto Salvation; and not meerly wiſe to attain a Temporal reward in this life, *ver.* 16. *All Scripture is profitable for Doctrine, for inſtruction in Righteouſneſs*: That the man of God (*i. e.* a Miniſter) may be perfect, throughly inſtructed to every good work; this is ſpoken of the Old Teſtament-Scripture.

Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, do Interpret the Life promiſed to the Obedient in the Law, as reaching to Future life, *Lev.* 18. 5. *The man that doth theſe Commands, ſhall live in them.* Ezek. 20. 11. *I gave them my Statutes, which if*

if a man do, he ſhall live in them. Gal. 3. 12. The Apoſtle cites theſe words: and by *Life*, takes it as a thing granted, that they meant Eternal life. Alſo *Rom.* 7. 10. *The Commandment that was unto life*: Mat. 19. 16, 17. *The young man asks, What ſhall I do to inherit Eternal life?* Chriſt anſwers, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments.* Which ſhew, that Life, and Eternal life, ſignifie the ſame, *Pſal.* 16. *ult. Thou wilt ſhew me the way of life, in thy preſence is fulneſs of joy; and, at thy right hand, are pleaſures for evermore.* Life here alſo ſignifies the Future life.

There are frequent Promiſes, That if they will keep his Commandments, He will be their God. The Apoſtle cites, *Lev.* 26. Where it is ſaid, *If you will walk in my Statutes, and keep my Judgments, and do them; then I will be your God, and you ſhall be my people*, Ver. 3. 12. Which was Gods part of the Covenant, his Engagement made to the people at Mount *Sinai*, as appears, *Ver.* 46. Now the Apoſtle having cited this Promiſe, amongſt o-

thers, 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. adds, *Having theſe Promiſes, let us cleanſe our ſelves*, &c. Which ſhews, That he underſtood theſe words, of Gods being one's God, to extend to Future happineſs. So *Mat.* 22. 31, 32, 33. Have you not read concerning the Reſurrection of the Dead? *I am the God of* Abraham, *and* Iſaac: Now God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living. So *Mark* 12. 26. By the words tranſlated, Reſurrection of the dead, in *Mat.* and Riſing in *Mark*, ſeems to be meant Immediately, and Primarily, only † ſubſiſting, and being in a Future-ſtate after death. And this was that which the *Sadduces* denied (as well as other things, conſequential thereto, and of leſs concernment, to ſupport this Opinion): And this was a moſt wicked Tenent, ſubverting virtually all Religion, which cannot be ſaid of an Opinion only denying the Reſurrection of the Body, provided a man did but hold a Future-ſtate of being, or ſubſiſtence of the Soul in happineſs, or miſery, accord-

† See Doctor *Hammonds* Annotation, *Mat.* 22. 31. well clearing this.

cording to a mans works in this life: But ſuch an erroneous Opinion might poſſibly be held, (for any thing I can ſee to the contrary) in thoſe more dark times, conſiſtent with this foundation of true Religion; that God is a Rewarder, in a Future life, of Obedience in this; and Puniſher of Diſobedience. And further, I do not think that the Reſurrection of the Body, was ſo clearly delivered in the Old Teſtament, as that one, believing all the Books of it to be Divine, might not yet hold it a diſputable Point; conſidering the difficulties that *Oppugne* it, and the obſcurity of the Scriptures affirming it; Though none of competent underſtanding, believing the New Teſtament, can now doubt of it. Now our Saviour's Argument drawn from theſe words, *I am the God of* Abraham, *and of* Iſaac, &c. ſince this was ſpoken to *Moſes*, and therefore after *Abraham* and *Iſaac* were dead; is cogent to prove (againſt the main foundational wicked Opinion of the *Sadducees*) *viz.* That *Abraham* and *Iſaac* were then in being, and alſo in Being in happineſs; for, had they been utterly ex-

tinct, or in beeing, but in no estate of happiness, He could not have said, *I am the God*, but only, at the most, *I was the God of* Abraham. He is not so much as the Sustainer, as the God, in such a low-sense, *of the dead*, viz. of men totally extinct; *but of the living*, viz. of men in actual being. And He cannot be called the God (which implies some wonderful, great, and infinite favour) of men, being indeed, and subsisting after their death, but being in misery, and dead in the sense wherein the Law threatned Future death; But only can be called a God to such men departed, as are in being, and also are in great happiness, and so are alive in the sense, the Law promised Future life.

Also Saint *John*, *Rev.* 22. 3, 4, 7. citeth that very Scripture fore-mentioned, *viz. Lev.*26.11,12. Where God promises from Mount *Sinai*, that if they would obey his Voice, *he would be their God* (It appears, He refers to this very Scripture, by the foregoing words in both places, of setting his Tabernacle amongst them.) And he interpreteth

eth the meaning of thoſe words, *of God's being one's God*, by expreſſions, denoting Life-to-come happineſs, As wiping away all tears; And death being no more, *ver.* 7. *He that overcometh ſhall inherit all things, and I will be his God.* And alſo, the Author to the *Hebrews*, *Chap.* 11. 14, 15, 16. explain's this phraſe, *of God being one's God.* All theſe dyed in the Faith, not having received the Promiſes, but, having ſeen them afar off, were perſwaded of them; and declared plainly, by confeſſing themſelves Pilgrims and Strangers, that they ſought a Country, and that not meerly *Canaan*, an earthly Country, but a Heavenly: Wherefore God is not aſhamed to be called their God; For he hath prepared for them a City (meaning Heaven, of which *Canaan* and *Jeruſalem*, were but Types:) Implying, that if that phraſe of being their God, had meant no more than giving them temporal good things in *Canaan*, it would have been a ſhamefully too high a word, for ſo low a thing, and that giving only ſuch low things as temporal Mercies

are, would have been unworthy of that Appellation, *of God being their God*: So that God might have been ashamed of using so Emphatical a Speech, in such a low signification. But he is therefore not ashamed of so high a profession of Friendship as those words import, since He builded for them a City, not made with hands, Eternal in the Heavens.

These following, are the only colourable replys made by some, or that can be made here, that I can call to mind.

First, It would be to no purpose to reply, The Old Testament had no Promises or Threats, of Life-to-come happiness, or misery; but, it typified Promises and Threats, of Life-to-come happiness, or misery:

For first, I suppose I have sufficiently proved, it had Life-to-come Promises and Threats.

Secondly, In the sense wherein it did typifie such Life-to-come good, or evil things, it had no Life-to-come Promises or Threats; else, it would typifie Promises of such Future-good things, in promising those Future-good things, which

which would be ridiculous to affirm.

Thirdly, In the ſenſe wherein it did typifie Life-to-come things, it was neither the ſtrict Law of Works, requiring perfect obedience, under the penalty of Future miſery, and promiſing Future happineſs thereon; Nor the Law of Grace or the Goſpel, promiſing Pardon as to Conſcience, and Future happineſs upon repentance and ſincere Obedience, but the Jewiſh political Law. And it is a palpable miſtake, though common to ſay otherwiſe.

Secondly, The Reply, That God intended Life and Death eternal, by the words uſed in the promiſes and threats, but the people could not ſo underſtand them, though they uſed their utmoſt integrity and diligence, Is already confuted: For then they would have been excuſable, and it would not have been ſaid, *they have* Moſes *and the Prophets, let them hear them*, &c. And I have made it apparent, the people did ſo underſtand them.

Thirdly, It is irrational to reply as ſome. We grant the ancient *Jews* did believe, God would give Eternal life to

the obedient, but God never promiſed it to them: Thus *Socinus*.

For firſt, Then they were to blame to believe it, if God never made any Notification of his Will, that it ſhould be ſo, It was then an Irrational fooliſh act for them when tortured, not to accept deliverance, that they might obtain a better Reſurrection, *Heb.* 11. 35.

Secondly, We read they believed and embraced the Promiſes of Future-life happineſs. So that, they had ſuch Promiſes, *Heb.* 11. and there was no more in their Faith, than in the Divine promiſe; no more in their Subjective, than in their Objective faith; than in the Revelation.

Thirdly, This is to affirm, that if they did well in thus believing, That they gave God, what was none of his own; gave to God what they had no power or ability from him to do, in believing what God never ſaid, and hoping for what God had never promiſed. This would be, To Supererogate in Faith and Hope, if it was but well done of them. But, to avoid ſuch Supereroga-

erogation, we muſt ſay, that ſuch doing would not have been acceptable to God, but a fooliſh, ſinful, irrational act: As it would be in a man now, to believe, and hope that if he ſerve God here, he ſhall have a fair Houſe built in the Moon, to dwell in for ever, when God hath made no Revelation, or Promiſe of any ſuch thing.

Fourthly, The moſt rational and probable reply poſſible of them that deny Life-to-come Promiſes, in the Old Teſtament-Writings, would be this: (though apparently falſe, and I know not of any that uſe it) That the *Jews* before Chriſt, had ſuch Promiſes of Future-life happineſs, and ſo were obliged to Piety; but they were revealed only by the light of Nature, and Providence, and not in the Scriptures. And that the *Jews* erred in looking for Eternal life from the Scriptures; For the Old Teſtament Scriptures were only written for the Common-wealth Temporal-Law, and to typifie Soul and Conſcience-concernments; but did not ſo far intermedle with Conſcience-concernments, as to threaten Future miſe-

ry

ry to any ſin; or to promiſe Eternal, or Future happineſs, on any Terms whatſoever.

But 1. I have proved, they had ſuch Promiſes in the Scriptures.

2. They had need of their Reaſon and Faculties, and of the Light and Law of Nature, and of all helps they had to underſtand theſe things in their Scripture; as we have alſo yet, to underſtand the Writings, both of the Old and New Teſtament.

3 I do hold, and could prove it apparently from the Scripture, That there were, and are, ſome diſcoveries by the Light of Nature, and Works of Providence, not only of the ſtrict Original-law, making Future miſery due to every ſin, and Future happineſs to perfect Obedience; But alſo of the Goſpel, or Law of Grace, *viz.* that God was placable, and that there was place for Repentance, and that God would receive ſinners to Future favour and happineſs, by pardoning their ſins upon Repentance and ſincere Obedience. It is apparent, The *Heathens* did ordinarily maintain this; and without doubt it

was

was not their Errour. And this they might gather from their beholding the preſent goodneſs of God to them, notwithſtanding their incorrigibleneſs in great ſins, in giving them Rain, and fruitful Seaſons, and filling their Hearts with Food and Gladneſs. Yea, they had ſo much Light, as to make them Inexcuſable, and Condemnable in not Repenting; which could not be if there was no Notification of his Will to receive them to Future-life favour upon Repentance; but rather (as ſome hold) were bound to believe that there was no forgiveneſs with him, no Future reward or happineſs Notified by ſuch goodneſs of God, in his Providence to men that were ſinners, and did need Repentance. Though I think the Scripture offers us ground to believe, That this way of Revelation, enough for their Condemnation, did not, (yet through their own wickedneſs) effectually prevail to turn any man throughly from ſin to God, or to cauſe ſuch Repentance to Life, as in its own Nature it dictated; any man I mean, that had no more or further Revelation from God. Now

if

if they had ſuch Diſcoveries, theſe are as properly Promiſes of a Future-life, and threatnings of Future-death as thoſe written.

Fourthly, It is apparent, that there was more cleer and convincing Diſcoveries of Future-life happineſs to the Obedient, and miſeries to the Diſobedient, in the Old Teſtament-Scriptures, than in the Law of Nature, and Book of Providence. The Law was given that the Offence might abound, and doth not only diſcover Duties, and Sins known by the light of Nature more cleerly, but the great danger of ſin, and happineſs that comes by obedience, more convincingly: yea; this diſcovers the Future-life happineſs, ſo much the more cleerly; that the Diſcoveries made to the *Heathen* of this, was no diſcovery comparatively, which is implied at leaſt in thoſe words, *Aliens from the Covenants of Promiſe, without hope.* And thoſe words, *they have* Moſes *and the Prophets*, &c. teach us, that there they were taught Future miſery due to ſinners, and Future happineſs to the Obedient, as convincingly, as if one

one roſe from the dead, to tell them of them. The Apoſtle *Paul* alſo ſpeaketh of the written Law, and therefore of the Old Teſtament-Law, as the *norma judicii*, as the rule of the Future judgment to them that lived under it, *Rom.* 2. 12. *As many as have ſinned without Law* (meaning, written Law) *ſhall periſh without Law*; *And as many as have ſinned in the Law, ſhall be judged by the Law*; (*viz.* at the Future judgment, as appears by the following words) Judged, that is, Juſtified or Condemned at the laſt day by the Law, which could not be, if the Law promiſed no Future-life, or threatned no Future-death. Alſo, by the Law, he means, the Law of *Moſes*, as appears by the following words, *ver.* 17. *Thou art called a* Jew, *and reſteſt in the Law*; and by the words [*until the Law*;] And [*until* Moſes] being uſed as equivalent terms by this Apoſtle, *Rom.* 5. 13, 14. compared.

Fifthly, It would be in vain for any to reply here, as the Author of the Book called *Friendly Debate* doth, who having ſaid, *Part* 1. *pag.* 26. "That the dif-

"fer-

"ference between the two Covenants, "is this, That the old Covenant made "with the *Jews*, had Temporal pro- "miſes; But the Goſpel, Eternal. And one in Anſwer to this Book, replying, that this is contrary to the ſeventh Article of the Church of *England*, which ſaith. "They are not to be heard, "who ſay, the Fathers looked for no "more than Tranſitory promiſes. "(Meaning things Promiſed.) In his Appendix to the third Part, *pag.* 150. He rejoyns, "I never thought that the "Fathers looked for no more than "Tranſitory promiſes; but, that it was "not by virtue of the Covenant made "with *Moſes*, that they looked for "more; I did, and do affirm. A great "many of the Worthies mentioned, "*Heb.* 11. lived before the Law was "given; and the reſt that followed "them, built their Expectation on the "ſame ground they did. Which alſo ſeems to be Doctor *Hammond*'s opinion, *viz.* That there were Promiſes of Future-life made to the more Ancient Patriarchs, but none in the *Moſaic*-Diſpenſation.

For

For, *Firſt*, Almoſt all the Arguments I have uſed, do convincingly prove this, That the Law of *Moſes* to the *Jews*, promiſed Future-life, as well as threatned Future-death. Now whether this Author holds the Law of *Moſes* threatned Future-life-death to any ſin, or not, I know not, but think I have proved both ſufficiently. Alſo, the Threats of *Moſes* Law, are expreſſed in as temporal a ſtile, as the Promiſes: ſo, it would be irrational, to affirm it threatned Future-death, but promiſed not Future-life.

Secondly, The promiſes made to *Abraham*, were made in as temporal a ſtile, as thoſe in the *Moſaic-Law*, if not in a far more temporal.

Thirdly, If it ſhall be urged (for I know, the miſunderſtanding of ſuch paſſages, occaſions this miſtake) that thoſe Promiſes made to *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, are Interpreted in the New Teſtament, as apparently reaching to a Future-life. I anſwer, So are the Promiſes of the Law of *Moſes* made with the *Jews*, *Rom.* 7. 10. *Chap.* 10. 5,6,7, 2 *Cor.*6.16. *Gal.*3.10,11,12.

And

And also the Threats.

Fourthly, It seems apparent to me, that that Dispensation of the Law from Mount *Sinai*, and the Land of *Moab*, was a clearer Dispensation of Threatnings of Future-death to the Disobedient, and Promises of Future Soul-life to the Obedient, than that to *Abraham*.

Sixthly, You cannot with any colour reply, It is true, there are Promises of Future-life, and Threatnings of Future-death(as this Author somewhere grants, but virtually, and often unsays it again) in *Moses* writings, but not in the Law of *Moses*,for these Promises and Threats were Gospel, in *Moses* writings.

For, *First*, I have spoken against this Opinion enough already.

Secondly, Some you see, deny any such Promises in the Jewish Law, And some any such Promises or Threats, in the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

Thirdly, If this was true, it would follow, That Christ never satisfied for any more, than a temporal Curse of the Law: For I have shewed the obsurdity, of saying that he satisfied for the

Curse

Curſe of the Goſpel in *Moſes* writings threatned.

Fourthly, The Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Law, in a ſenſe diſtinct from the Goſpel in *Moſes* writings, wherein it had Spiritual commands, and that to Life, meaning Eternal-life, and alſo Future life Threats; ſaying, Chriſt hath born the Curſe of the Law for us. So *Rom. 3. 20. By the deeds of the Law, ſhall no fleſh be juſtified in his ſight: For by the Law is the knowledg of ſin.*

So, that I may conclude from what hath been here ſaid, that the utmoſt that can be ſaid in derogating from the Law, is:

Firſt, That the Law of *Moſes*, as it was the Common-wealth Law, had no Eternal Promiſes, or Threats, or Spiritual Commands. And in this ſenſe are many Scriptures, produced by this Author to be underſtood.

Secondly, That the Law of *Moſes*, and the Old Teſtament-Law diſpenſation, taken in the Important ſenſe, as refering to Conſcience, and Soul-ſalvation, or damnation, both in the ſenſe wherein it was the Original-law of

Works; And alſo in the ſenſe wherein it was the Goſpel, or a Law of Grace and Pardon, hath no ſuch cleer and diſtinct Promiſes of Eternal-life, and threatnings of Eternal-death, as are in the New Teſtament-Scriptures. And in this comparative ſenſe, may ſome places of Scripture ſpeaking in extenuation of the Law-promiſes be underſtood, as being no Spiritual promiſes, or Promiſes of Heaven, comparatively to theſe in the New Teſtament: And multitudes of Inſtances may be brought, of Scriptures denying poſſitively, and yet to be underſtood only comparatively.

As for Inſtance: That place, 2 *Tim.* 1. 10. where we read, that Chriſt hath brought Life, and Immortality to light, through this clearer Diſpenſation of the Goſpel, muſt be underſtood comparatively (as this Author grants, though he deſtroys his whole Argumentation by granting it:) And may poſſibly be underſtood only of bringing them to light among the *Gentiles*, who are ſaid to be without hope, being aliens from the Covenants of Promiſe: For he ſaith in the

the *verse* following, *He was made a Teacher of the* Gentiles, viz. *in these things.* Now, though the light of Nature and Providence, taught them Future-life happiness to the Obedient, and Future misery and death to the Disobebient; yet they taught these things so obscurely and faintly, That they living wickedly, and contrarily to the Light they had, and so making it their interest, to wish there was no Future-life, might with ease stiffle and bafle such natural Sentiments, so far as to hope there was no such Future state; or however, to make it a disputable Point, as it was amongst them: I mean, more easily than the *Jews*, that had the Law given in a dreadful manner, testifying these things, and credibly, and convincingly brought down to them by Irrefragable testimony; and more easily by far, than men now.

But it is probable also, this Scripture is to be understood comparatively, to the Jewish dispensation of the Law and Gospel, by *Moses* and the Prophets. And indeed, though it is so apparent, that the *Jews* were taught a Future-life

of Retribution by the Scripture of the Old Teſtament, elſe thoſe Scriptures could not have taught the Foundation of Religion, and they did ſo underſtand the Scriptures: That it is a wonder, ſo many Learned men ſhould incline to any Notions contrary; yet, the evidence they had of theſe things, was very obſcure, to what this open-fac'd Diſpenſation of the Goſpel affords; and eſpecially, as to the exact manner of the great Judgment by Chriſt Jeſus, *Acts* 17. 31. And of Bodys being raiſed, and made glorious like Chriſt's Body, *&c.* And alſo, without doubt, the beſt of them had very little particular hope and aſſurance, ordinarily comparatively to this cleer Goſpel-diſpenſation; That they themſelves in particular, ſhould enjoy the Future bleſſed ſtate: For they that knew but little of Chriſts ſatisfaction as comparatively to us, they did (which being now with open face known, anſwereth ſuch perplexing difficulties, as they were ordinarily perplexed with, and made ſubject to Bondage through fear of death) could not ordinarily but be much perplex-

plexed, thinking, though it is apparent by the Teſtimony of God himſelf, he will pardon ſinners, yet every truly Pious perſon might be ready to ſay, he will ſurely hardly pardon ſuch great ſins as mine are: How can he with ſafety to his Juſtice?

Now further, to enable any to anſwer many Scriptures, which this Author brings, to maintain his extenuating Expreſſions of the Law (Though ſuch Scriptures are not immediately ſerviceable to diſcover the Apoſtle's meaning, where he aſcribes Juſtification to Faith, in oppoſition to Works, elſe I would have taken more particular notice of them) Remember what I ſpoke before, that ſometimes, not only the Author to the *Hebrews*, but this Apoſtle in ſpeaking of the Law, underſtands by it; the Jewiſh Common-wealth Law threatning Violent, Immature, Temporal death to all External viſible ſins, and in ſome caſes, allowing Sacrifices, in the ſtead of this violent death, in other caſes not. And the occaſion of the ſo uſing the word, Law, (which you may poſſibly think very Improper, when

ſpeaking of Conſcience-concernments) is this; It was the common, yea, almoſt Univerſally profeſſed Opinion of the *Jews*, ſometime before, and about thoſe days of the Apoſtles, taught them by all their *Rabbies*, As this Author alſo affirms, *pag.* 306. That the Law did not threaten Future puniſhment to any ſins, but to thoſe that it, as the common Law of the Land, threatned Temporal violent death to, to be Executed by the Magiſtrate: And that the Law required no more to Future ſalvation, than ſo much as was made neceſſary by it, to eſcape violent death; And alſo, that the expiation of their Sacrifices (which were for faults, granted by them to be ſins threatned by their Law with Future death) reached ſo far as to expiate, and abſolve them from ſins as to Future puniſhment; which Opinion, the Author to the *Hebrews* at large oppoſes. And ſince they could not but grant, that there were commands of inward Holineſs, forbiding Heart-adultery, and Heart-murther, and meer inward coveting, as the Tenth Commandment, and commands to fear and love the Lord, and walk

walk in his Ways, and keep his Commandments with all their heart and soul, *Deut.* 10. 12. *Chap.* 11. 13. And it would not be Sense, or it would be Remiss sense to say, that keeping the Commandments (as for example, of not doing Murder, or not committing Adultery) with the whole heart, was only to abstain from the outward Fact, without avoiding the occasions, beginnings, or causes thereof; They held these were not properly Commands, that any penalty of Exclusion from Heaven, or that Future-life death was threatned unto; But that these Precepts, were only Councels recommended to them that had a mind to do the best, and that it was commendable, and men did well to observe them; but the refusing to obey these, was not sin by their Law, nor punishable with any Future misery. And the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, the wicked Doctors of this, and some former degenerate Ages, making it their study almost unanimously to excuse themselves and others from inward Piety (which they were resolved against, as being the most difficult part of true

Religion, and moſt ingrateful to fleſh and blood) might have this pretence from the Law it ſelf, to maintain their Fleſh-pleaſing expoſition of the Law, to quiet their own and others Conſciences in the neglect of inward Purity, *viz.* There is no violent penal Temporal death threatned to ſuch ſins, to be inflicted by the Magiſtrate, as there is to all External ſins; therefore it is likely, there is no Eternal, or Future puniſhment threatned by the Law for ſuch; there are no Expiations appointed for ſuch ſins, ſurely therefore they are no ſins, and need no Expiations.

Theſe *Phariſaical* Doctors did hold, their Law promiſed Future-life, and threatned Future puniſhment; but * taught the people that if they were but *juſti ad legem* (righteous according to the Law, in the ſenſe that *Seneca* uſeth the word; ſaying, *Exignum eſt ad legem bonum eſſe*,) that is, Righteous ſo far as the Law

* I ſhewed you at the beginning, four true ſenſes of the Jewiſh Law, all intended by the Law-giver. But the *Phariſaical Jews* maintained a fifth ſenſe, and that a falſe and pernicious one, *viz.* That their Law promiſed the Future-life happineſs, to their obſerving the Law Politically and Externally.

Law of the Land was to compel them by Temporal puniſhment, as all thoſe were that had committed none of thoſe Crimes, that were excluded from attaining Temporal pardon by Sacrifice, and had offered Sacrifice for their other External faults; they were as perfectly righteous before God, as their Law in any ſenſe required them to be. So becauſe the Law, as the Law of the Land, appointed no puniſhment for one that put away his wife for any light cauſe, ſo he did but ſet her wholly at liberty by a Bill of Divorce to marry another, they were taught it was no ſin ſo to put away a Wife, *Mat.* 5. 31. Alſo, becauſe the Law, as the Common-wealth Law, gave men liberty to require an Eye for an Eye, and Tooth for Tooth, and if they ſo required it, the Magiſtrate was bound to Inflict it, *Deut.* 19. 21. They were taught, it was no ſin to ſeek this revenge in any caſe. And ſo, that the Commands of forgiving Injuries, were but Counſels, as *Prov.* 24. 29. and *Chap.* 20. 22. Say not, *I will do to him, as he hath done to me*, Lev. 19. 17, 18. *Thou ſhalt not hate thy brother*

in

in thy heart, thou ſhalt not avenge, nor bear any grudg, &c. *But ſhalt love thy Neighbour as thy ſelf,* Rev. 25. 21. *If thy enemy hunger, give him meat,* &c. Exod. 23. 4, 5. *If the Aſs of thy enemy wander, or be faln under his burden, bring him back, or help him up*: Which Opinion of theirs, Chriſt confutes, *Mat. 5. v. 21. You have heard, that it hath been ſaid, by them of old, or to them of old, thou ſhalt not Kill, and whoſoever ſhall Kill, ſhall be in danger of the Judgment.*

That is, you have been told it as a Tradition, taught by the Ancients, or to the Ancients, by ſome Ancient *Rabbies*, that you break not any Law of God, nor incur danger of Future torments by anger, hatred, or approbrious ſpeeches; but only he that actually kills, ſhall be in danger of Future puniſhment; of the Court of Judgment, the κρίσις, which litterally ſignifies, is in danger of the Court of the 23 Elders, that ſate in the † Gates of the City, and put Offenders to death by the Sword. Now, ſince Murtherers in Fact were to be put to death only, & not they that

† Deut. 16. 18. Chap. 19. 11, 12.

that only hated or reproached another, the * Doctors hence gathered, and taught the people by this Argument, that none elſe was threatned by the Law, with Future puniſhment. And ſo that the Commandment reached no further than to prohibit the External act, under a Future penalty; and that ſuch ſpeeches as, *Thou ſhalt not hate thy Brother in thy heart.* And, *Be not haſty in thy ſpirit, to be angry: Anger reſteth in the boſome of Fools*, Eccleſ. 7. 9. were but Counſels.

* *Damnat Chriſtus in Phariſæis quod legis Doctrinam ad Politicum ordinem tranſtulerant, ut ſufficeret externis officiis defungi. Ita fiebat ut ſe ab homicidio abſolveret quiſquis hominem manu non occiderat. Se purum & caſtum putaret coram Deo quiſquis Adulteria corpus non polluerat. Hæc vero erat minime ferenda Legis profanatio, quum certum ſit ſpiritualem Dei cultum a* Moſe *requiri, & Deus cordibus non minus quam manibus & oculis loquutus eſt: Reus erit judicio. Hoc membrum confirmat quod diximus, vitium illud reprehendi, quod lex Dei quæ regendis animis tradita fuit, in Politiam converſa erat.* Calv. in Loc.

Now *ver.* 22. Chriſt teacheth them the true meaning of the Law, and ſince their *Rabbies* uſed the word, *the Judgment*, to ſignifie Future puniſhment, he doth ſo too. *But I ſay unto you, that he that is angry with his brother without a cauſe*; though his anger do not proceed

ceed ſo far as to kill him, nor to any outward Expreſſion, is yet guilty of Murder in the ſenſe of the Law, and ſo obnoxious to the Future death ſignified by you to be due to the External act, and meant by the Word, *the Judgment*, in the former Speech; which primarily ſignifies, putting to death with the Sword.

And he that ſhall proceed ſo much further in cauſleſs anger, as to uſe only ſome leſſer words of reproach, as *Racha*, ſhall be yet in danger of a greater puniſhment in the Future-life, ſhall be in. danger of the Συνέδριον, The Council; of the *Jeruſalem*-Court of Seventy; that is, of a ſeverer Future-death, anſwerable to the Puniſhment which uſed to be inflicted by the *Sanhedrim* (which word came from συνίζειν) who ordinarily puniſhed Offenders, with ſtoning to death.

But whoſoever ſhall, though not kill his Brother, yet proceed ſo far in wrath as to ſay, *thou fool*, i. e. to uſe the moſt Villifying and Approbrious expreſſi-

preſſions, ſhall be puniſhed hereafter with death * anſwerable to the being put to death with fire, in the Valley of *Hinnom*; which was a more cruel death than by the Sword, or Stoning; and the meaning of it well known to the *Jews*, though no judicial death; and uſed often by them, and ſometimes by the Scripture, to ſignifie Future torments. And the word ſhould have been thus Tranſlated, viz. *Shall be in danger of the fire of the Valley of* Hinnom *or* Tophet: For as it is Tranſlated, it is apt to miniſter a doubt to the Vulgar, as if the

* Chriſt's Speech could proceed no further in keeping to the Metaphor, expreſſing Future puniſhment by Jewiſh courts, ſince no other but the two

ſore-mentioned inflicted the puniſhment of death. And though it may be Objected, that one of theſe Courts alſo put to death by burning, however in two caſes, viz. of a *Prieſts daughter committing whoredom*, Lev. 21 9. And of a *man lying with his Wives Mother*, Lev. 20.14. Yet theſe were, it is probable, crimes ſeldom happning, ſo that the ordinary puniſhment of the higheſt Court was (as it is commonly agreed) Stoning: And however this would no way have ſerved to have carried on the begun Metaphor, which expreſſed the Gradation of puniſhments by ſeveral Courts, ſince this was a puniſhment by the ſame Court, and rarely uſed. Now ſince the Court of Judicature is put in this ſpeech, to ſignifie immediately the puniſhment of the Court, it was moſt conſentaneous to rational Speech, to ſignifie by it the ordinary puniſhment of the Court: And ſo he expreſſes the third Degree of Future puniſhment due to the third and greateſt Offence mentioned by him, by a burning to death in *Tophet*, that was often uſed by the *Jews* to expreſs Future puniſhment.

two

two former ſort of offences were not by Chriſt accounted to be threatned with Hell; whereas had it been Tranſlated according to the Words, it would have been more eaſie, and occaſioned no ſuch doubt; the Judgment, the Council, the fire of *Hinnom*, all equally ſignifying Future death and puniſhment, and only here uſed to denote Degrees of puniſhment in Hell. Yea, and Chriſt here aſſigns as great a Future puniſhment to the leaſt offence, *viz.* Anger, as they did to actual Murther.

Now it will appear to you, no great unlikelyhood, that the Jewiſh Doctors gave ſuch a looſe Interpretation of the Law, if you conſider, that it is a growing Opinion at this day, taught by ſome of our own Doctors (as well as by *Socinus*) that no more was commanded to the *Jews*; however, not under the penalty of Future death, but only ſuch External obedience. "And if perhaps, "there were any Commands in the "Old Teſtament-Scriptures, requiring "ſuch Internal obedience, as is requi-"red by Chriſt in his Sermon on the "Mount, they were glimmerings of

"the

"the Goſpel, and not Univerſally com-
"manded to all under threat of Eter-
"nal puniſhment, but only recom-
"mended to them that will do what is
"beſt, *Pract. Cat. pag.* 141. Though
"now, ſince Chriſts Sermon in the
"Mount, they are acknowledged to be
"Commands, which not to do, is a ſin;
"and not only Counſels of Perfection,
"which to do, is to do better, *pag.* 142.
But Doctor *Taylor* (if I can underſtand him) holds, that now no Law threatens Hell to the neglect of them, but that they are yet Counſels left to a man's choice. *Unum Neceſ. pag.* 48, 49.

You may find this Opinion maintained by many, who pretend that Chriſt's oppoſitions, *Mat.* 5. to what hath been ſaid by others, were however in ſeveral of thoſe ſayings referring to the Ten Commandments, really Additions to the Law; and not vindications of the right true ſenſe of it againſt falſe Fleſh-pleaſing expoſitions: And that the Law till Chriſt made thoſe Additions to it in his Sermon in the Mount, did not as a Law, require any, however not with any Threat of Future puniſhment to abſtain

ſtain from Heart-Adultery, or Heart-Murder, provided it proceeded not to the External fact. Now I look upon my ſelf as bound, here to anſwer the Arguments for that Opinion, *viz.* That that is a true notion of the Jewiſh Law, as referring to Conſcience, and the Future life-ſtate. For if this be ſo, All that I here ſpeak thus largely, and make apparent chiefly from this *Chapter* (which you will at laſt, I hope, ſee the neceſſity of, for the Interpreting many Scriptures of the New Teſtament that ſpeak derogatory to the Law) will fall to the ground. The ſtrongeſt Arguments by which they prove their Opinion, are ſuch as theſe. *Pract. Catech. pag.* 136.

" *Firſt*, The moſt of the Fathers " (eſpecially of the *Greeks*) before St. " *Auſtines* time ſo held.

Anſw. 1. I could eaſily, I think, make it appear, that the moſt of them held the contrary. 2. The moſt of the Citations produced, may be made appear, either not to prove that to be their Opinion, but are capable of another Conſtruction, or they might be forced

forced to that Expoſition, to maintain now-acknowledged Errours frequent in thoſe days, as that it is unlawful under the Goſpel to Swear, or War, in any caſe, though it was not unlawful by the Law of Nature, or the Moral Law.

"*Secondly*, The Fathers give theſe "two reaſons for this their Opinion: "1. Becauſe Chriſt under the Goſpel, "gives either higher or plainer Promi- "ſes than he did before. 2. Becauſe "he gives more grace now to perform "them (*viz.* the Commandments) "than before he had done. The Law "given by *Moſes* was a Carnal Law, "that is, weak, not accompanied with "ſtrength to perform what it requires; "but the Goſpel of Chriſt, the Ad- "miniſtration of the Spirit, *i. e.* a means "to Adminiſter the Spirit to our hearts, "to enable us to do what he commands "us to do.

As for the firſt Reaſon ſaid to be the Fathers. 1. I cannot ſee it's Co- gency. 2. The *Heathens* knew by the Light of Nature, that Heart-adultery and Murther, and that taking Gods Name in vain in Swearing cuſtomarily,

or Luſoriouſly, or Idle, were ſins; ſurely, then the *Jews* had Light enough to make them inexcuſable in theſe things, before Chriſt's Sermon in the Mount, and ſo ſuch were ſins in them.

And for Anſwer to the ſecond Argument, I can neither underſtand the Cogency, nor the Conſiſtency of it.

Firſt, It is apparent to me, that men are not one jot the leſs obliged by the Law, becauſe of God's not giving them Grace to obey it, becauſe I do not think that giving the Natural ability to Obey, is to be called giving Grace, or an effect of Grace, but of Juſtice, ſo as men could not in Juſtice be obliged to obey the Law without it.

Secondly, The Law of the Ten Commandments (for that is it the Doctor ſpeaks of, and only pretends Chriſts addition to) was not in the true Conſcience-ſenſe a Carnal Law, but a Spiritual, *Rom.* 7.

Thirdly, If the *Jews* had no ſtrength to perform what this Law required, it muſt be granted, that they were not obliged by the Law to avoid Heart-ſins, and Thought-ſins.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, Methinks this undo's all, to give this as a Reaſon, why the *Jews* were not forbidden ſuch Inward-ſins as are under Diſpute, *viz.* "Becauſe "they had no ability to perform what "the Law commanded: For it is to grant, the Law did command them to abſtain from ſuch things, which this Argument is brought to prove, it did not forbid till Chriſt made that Addition.

"*Thirdly*, The word Tranſlated, *ful-*"*fil* (ver. 17. *Think not that I am* "*come to deſtroy the Law, or the Prophets;* "*I am not come to deſtroy, but to fulfil* "*them*) ſignifies to perfect, and fill-up "that which was imperfect before.

I Anſwer, It cannot be denied but the word is uſed in divers ſignifications. But ſetting aſide what other things may be oppoſed to that ſenſe of the Word, I ſhall only ſay this: The ſureſt way to know the ſenſe of the word πληρῶσαι, to *fulfil*, in this place, is by the word here oppoſed to it, which is καταλῦσαι, to diſſolve, or deſtroy the Law. Now it is apparent, that by Deſtroying, is meant Enervating, and

Evacuating the Obligation of the Law, by a too favourable Expoſition, which is called in the *Verſe* following, *breaking* the Commandment, and teaching men ſo to do; Therefore by the word *fulfil*, muſt be meant to aſſert, and maintain it's ſtrictneſs and obligation, to vindicate it from ſuch evacuating Expoſitions. The meaning of the *Verſe*, is, *Think not*, &c. *i. e.* You will be deceived, if you ſhall ſuppoſe that I am come to Teach (as your Doctors) that are in the greateſt Repute, do, who make it their great buſineſs, to gratifie you in making the Law to be of very little extent, ſo as not to forbid Heart-ſins, but to alow thoſe, and many evil practices. I am not come thus to diſſolve the Law, but to fulfil, *i. e.* to vindicate it to it's true ſenſe, from ſuch Evacuating gloſſes.

Fourthly, That theſe words [*you "have heard*] ſignifies, you have been "taught out of the Books of *Moſes*; "and [It hath been ſaid by them of old "time] ſhould be read (according as "the Margent alſo of our Bibles tran-"ſlates them) it hath been ſaid to them

"of

"of old time, that is to the *Jews* your "Anceſtors by *Moſes*.

Anſwer, 1. The words may be read, *either* it hath been ſaid to them of old, or *by* them of old, without any inconvenience or alteration of the ſenſe, for *if* ſaid by them of old; then be ſure, *to* them of old; and if it was ſaid to the Ancients, then by the Ancients. 2. The meaning ſeems to be, Theſe Expoſitions of the Law, have been taught you with a pretence of their † Antiquity, as being taught the Ancients, by the Ancients, *i. e.* that is, ſome Generations ſince by *Rabbie's*. 3. But that the meaning ſhould be, Theſe things were taught you by *Moſes* in the Ten Commandments; But I now either add, or oppoſe this Interpretation, to what was the true former meaning, ſeems wonderfully unlikely by this (to ſay no more) That this is not the uſual phraſe of Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, in citing Scripture, *viz.* you have heard it *hath* been ſaid; neither is this † manner of Speech, or any akin to it, ever uſed in this ſenſe; and therefore ſeems to be a way of citing Traditional Expoſitions,

† *Calv. in Loc.*

† *Calv. in Loc.*

ſitions. When Chriſt citeth Scripture, he uſeth to ſay, *You have read*, *Mat.* 12.35. *Mark* 12.26, *Luk.* 10.26. Not as here, *You have heard*: And he uſeth to ſay, *It is written*, *Mat.* 4.4,6,10. *Luke* 2.23. and 10.26. *John* 8.17. *Chap.* 10.38. Not as here, *It hath been ſaid.*

"*Fifthly*, In theſe words, [*Except* "*your righteouſneſs exceed the righte-* "*ouſneſs of the* Scribes *and* Phariſees; "that is, which they think themſelves "obliged to, and teach others that they "are obliged to, *you cannot enter*;] "Sure, Chriſt doth not pitch on the "names of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, "as thoſe that were the greateſt Evacu- "ators of the Law, by their own hy- "pocritical Practices, or falſe Gloſſes "in ſome particulars; but as the moſt "exact and learned Sect, as thoſe that "ſate in *Moſes* Chair, *i. e.* taught there "truly the Doctrine of the *Moſaical-* "*Law*, in that manner as others were "obliged to perform it.

Anſwer, 1. Then Chriſt doth not bring in theſe Names here, as he is wont to do, for he uſeth to charge them with

with making void the Law through Traditions.

2. It seems apparent, he means by the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, the same that he doth by those that break the Commandments, and teach others so to do.

3. I grant they had generally the repute of the strictest Teachers, and Livers, as to External and less weighty matters of the Law; but yet they generally are charged to make void the Law by their Lives and Doctrines, as to Internal obedience, and most weighty concernments. Surely it is not all one as if he had said, *Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of* Moses, Joshuah, Samuel, and David, (which they taught other, and thought themselves and others obliged to) *you cannot enter*; which yet seems to be the Doctors meaning.

4. The people were to hear them, and also to take heed how they heard, *and beware of the leaven of the* Pharisees. They were to embrace their Doctrine only so far as they sate in *Moses* Chair, and taught *Moses*'s Doctrine truly.

"*Sixthly*, Christ expresseth the saying opposed, or added to by him in "the very words of the Ten Commandments: Therefore to say, he "speaks by way of Opposition, and "not of Addition, would be to say, "he opposes the very Commandments.

Answer 1. He doth so only in one place of this *Chapter*, viz. *ver.* 27. *Thou shalt not commit Adultery.*

2. Any one may yet perceive, by his following Opposition, what it is he meant by those words, and what it is he opposed, *viz.* Not the very Law, or the true sense of the Law, but that Exposition of the Law, which laid the stress on the word *commit*, as if it meant only commit with the outward Fact, and forbad nothing else: And it is apparent, the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* so taught.

The Doctor giveth us another Argument, taken from a saying of Saint *John*, which carrieth so little evidence in my opinion, that I would not have here set it down, but that he seems to lay so great stress, not only on this his In-

Interpretation of Chriſts Words, as being (as he ſaith) "A foundation of "a great and weighty Superſtructure, but alſo upon that Scripture, as being (as he ſaith) a remarkable place to prove it. The words are theſe, "1 *John* 1.5. "*God is Light, and in him is no dark-* "*neſs at all.* The meaning whereof, "he ſaith, is this, That God is Light, "and in him is no Darkneſs at all in re- "ſpect of his Law and Command- "ments, the rule of mens lives; and "implies, that theſe had before (*viz.* "Chriſt's teaching) ſome indulgence "for ſome ſins; and where they had "not ſo, yet they had ſome mixture of "Imperfection, but now they have "none; they had before ſome Vacui- "ties in them, which are now filled up "by Chriſt.

Anſwer 1. I ſee no evidence or probability, that this is the meaning of theſe words.

2. We read, *The Law of the Lord is perfect*, i. e. without Imperfection; *and is Light*, i. e. without darkneſs, and this was ſpoken of the Law before Chriſts Teaching.

3. I cannot understand the consistency of these words, That the Law and Commandments, the Rule of mens lives, had before Indulgence for some sins; If no Law forbad them, they were not sins, or if it did not forbid them under the penalty of Future-death, then they were not sins: For, I have, I suppose, made it appear, it threatned Future death to all sins, and else none were pardoned those sins as to Future death, because they did need no such Pardon.

4. Nor can I understand the words following. That where the Law, the Rule of mens lives, did not allow Indulgence for some sins, yet it had some mixture of Imperfection. I cannot imagine how this appears; for none will surely say, it appears in this, that it did not require some thing the Law now requires, as Baptisme, and the Lords Supper, for that will no more prove the Law imperfect then, then that the Law of God is now imperfect in not requiring circumcision; whereas the Law did then, as it doth now, require all to obey whatsoever he should any way whatsoever com-

command them, and that under the penalty of Future-death.

5. You may ſee by what hath been ſaid, That the Law, not as referring to Conſcience, and Future-life; but as the Jewiſh Common-wealth Law, did allow or indulge ſome things; that is, ſo far as not to threaten violent death to them at all, and ſo in this Common-wealth ſenſe, did not forbid ſuch Practiſes at all; which yet the Law in the moſt Important and Conſcience ſenſe did forbid, and ſo were ſins threatned with Future-death. As for example: The putting away a Wife for any cauſe, and Heart-murther, and Heart-adultery.

Alſo, I have made apparent, that the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, the Jewiſh Doctors taught, and it was an Opinion ordinarily received amongſt the *Jews*, in the days of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that if men were but *juſti ad legem*; that is, righteous ſo far, as to be free from ſuch things as Temporal death, was by the Law of the Land remedileſly threatned to, and had offered Sacrifice for ſuch as the Law allowed it for,

for, they were either as righteous as any Law of God, in the utmoſt rigour, required them to be, or however, at the leaſt, as righteous as the Law of God in the indulgent Goſpel-ſenſe required them as neceſſary to their Future ſalvation; And that Chriſt oppoſeth in this *Chapter*, the common Jewiſh conceit, taught by their Doctors.

And without doubt, there was no *Jew* ever ſaved by that Law of *Moſes*, taken in the Goſpel-ſenſe, as all good men that lived under it were, that did not more than was required by that Law in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, as the Law of the Land threatning violent death to be Executed by the Magiſtrate. As for example, that did not love and fear God, and endeavour inward Holineſs, and the repreſſing of the inward ſins, which the Law in the Political ſenſe required not. And again, All ſaved by that Law, did far leſs than was required by that Law, as the Original ſtrict Law under the penalty of Future-death, For all ſaved, were pardoned as to Future-death, as to ſome Heart-ſins; which could not be, if ſuch ſins were

not

not Threatned with Future-death.

Now upon this false foundation (*viz.* That the Law of God as to Conscience, required no more than it required as the Law of the Land) was without doubt built that Interpretation of the 18. *ver.* of *Psal.* 66. given by the Ancient famous Rabbi, *David Kimchi*, who upon the words, which are these [*If I regard iniquity with my heart, the Lord will not hear me,*] gives this as the meaning, *viz.* "Though I shall see "Iniquity in my heart, which I am for- "ward to execute in fact; Though "God do see it, yet he will not hear it "(meaning he will not impute it to me "for sin:) For God doth not charge a "wicked Thought, for a wicked Act, "except only a wicked Thought a- "gainst the Faith and true Religion, so "as to worship Idols: For this, such Doctors did hold to be sin threatned with Future punishment, though it proceeded not to the Fact, but not any other wicked Thought or Intention.

And it seems apparent, the Apostle *Paul* took the Law in this Vulgar sense, when he saith *Phil.* 3. 6. *He had been a* Pha-

Phariſee, *and touching the righteouſneſs which is of the Law blameleſs.* That is, he had lived without fault, ſo far as the Law required in that ſenſe, wherein the moſt *Jews* then, and he himſelf formerly (being ſo taught by his Maſter *Gamaliel*) underſtood it, *viz.* in this external Political ſenſe. And though he had formerly accounted that perfect Obedience to the Law, or however all required to his ſalvation; yet now he looketh upon ſuch Righteouſneſs as inſignificant as to Future ſalvation, and underſtood the Law was truly Spiritual and required more, yea more neceſſarily for ſalvation, even Internal Piety; and ſo could not have ſpoken after that manner, of his Righteouſneſs according to the Law, in the true important ſenſe of the Law.

And hence it comes to paſs (ſince the Law was uſed by moſt of the *Jews* in thoſe days, in this external Political, and Ritual ſenſe.) That the Author to the *Hebrews*, doth almoſt (I think altogether) conſtantly uſe this word, the Law, in this ſenſe, but confutes their erronious Opinion, that held that

in

in this ſenſe it availed to Salvation in a Future-life; and ſhews it in this ſenſe, made none perfect as to Conſcience, or Future-life concern's, but only as it threatned violent death, and excluſion from Society; ſo the Sacrifices for Expiation, reached not to Expiate ſins as to Future-life concerns, but only to free from the Temporal puniſhment of Death, and Excluſion from the Congregation.

And hence alſo it comes to paſs, that the Apoſtle *Paul* often uſeth the word, *the Law*, in this Political ſenſe, Though it is apparent he doth not ſo, when he denies Juſtification by the Law as to Future-life, by reaſon of mens ſinfulneſs; as it is apparent he doth in thoſe places, that ſeem oppoſite to St. *James*. (And this Author alſo confeſs it) For mans ſinfulneſs, could not poſſibly be any reaſon why men were not Juſtified as to Future-life by the Law, in that Political ſenſe, wherein it neither promiſed Future-life, nor threatned Future death.

You muſt obſerve diligently, as you deſire to underſtand the Apoſtle *Paul* in many

many places, that he often passes from the Conscience strict sense of the Law, opposed to the Gospel, to the Common-wealth sense of the Law, as *Gal.*3. and often runs them together, as *Rom.*7. using the word *sometime*, in one of the senses, and intermixing passages that agree to it in the other; which I could give you, I think, a satisfying account of, and would indeavour by reciting the particular places; but that I am sensible, I speak more largely than is suitable for such a short Discourse as I intend.

Now, to draw to a conclusion of this long Digression, designed to help you to understand many Scriptures. Since so many took the Law in this low sense, as requiring so short an obedience, and foolishly promised themselves that Eternal happiness, in the observance of it so far, which it never promised them; It is no wonder that you find so many extenuating Expressions of it, in this sense. Not that any such Expressions extenuate it as the Common-wealth Law; for it was an excellent one imposed by the only Wise God, and fitted to the temper

per of the Jewish people, and to Typifie the great things; But they extenuate it: 1. As a way of Salvation, for it promised no such thing, made nothing perfect as to Conscience and Eternal life, though observed with the greatest exactness.

2. It is not extenuated as a shadow or resemblance, Typical of the great things, for it was a wonderful perfect Shadow and Type; But it is extenuated as being but a Shadow (which the the *Jews* would have to be the very substance, the way of Salvation it self) of the great concernments; a poor and beggarly Rudiment, or * Element, or rude first Draught, or representation of the great Realities.

3. As that which was but Temporary, and to vanish away as this Typical Common-wealth Law was to do, at the fuller Exhibition of the things it was but a Type of.

4. This is called the Letter; the very outward Letter of the Old Testa-

* I could, I think, give satisfying Reasons, that the Law in this sense only, is by the Apostle called a School-master, to teach the first beggarly Letters, or Elements, and so to cease its imployment, and not at all in the strict Conscience sense.

ment for the moſt part (though yet frequently otherwiſe) holding forth the Law in this Common-wealth ſenſe, with the rewards, proſperity in *Canaan*, and the threats, Temporal death. And in its being called the Letter, it is oppoſed to the Internal and Spiritual meaning of that Law, as it was the ſtrict Law and the Goſpel; and to this cleerer Diſpenſation of both the Law and Goſpel under Chriſt, and called the *Oldneſs of the Letter*, being the Old common way they had been taught by their Doctors, and educated in. For the Goſpel, and more Spiritual way of the *Moſaic-Law*, was New, and ſtrange to them (as you may perceive by *John* the Baptiſt's Doctrine of Repentance for the Remiſſion of ſins, being rejected by the *Phariſees*) as well as this cleer Diſpenſation under Chriſt, though that was the true way of Salvation from the beginning ever ſince mans fall.

5. The Law in this ſenſe, is ſaid *to kill*, and to be a Miniſtry of condemnation, though not only in this ſenſe, I ſuppoſe, but alſo in this ſenſe taken in

Con-

Conjunction with the ſtrict Law of Works revealed in, by, and with this Law. It is ſaid *to kill, and condemn:* 1. Becauſe this Law did condemn with Temporal violent death, every one that did neglect any ſuch external Work whatſoever. But did not juſtifie to a proſperous life in *Canaan*, any but they that obſerved every *puntilio* of it. 2. Or rather, ſince the Apoſtle uſeth ſometimes to run the Law in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, exacting perfect Obedience, and the Law in this Political ſenſe together. The Law may be ſaid to condemn, and to be a Miniſtry of condemnation, becauſe the Law did as the Original ſtrict Law of Works in reality, though not in their Opinion, condemned every man that did not all whatſoever required; yea, that fail'd in obedience to any Internal command, and did alſo condemn as to Conſcience, all External failings, which they alſo held, but did not quicken, or revive, or juſtifie any as to Future-life; Not the Political Law, through it's own weakneſs and default, having no ſuch Promiſes to any performances whatſoever:

ment for the moſt part (though yet frequently otherwiſe) holding forth the Law in this Common-wealth ſenſe, with the rewards, proſperity in *Canaan*, and the threats, Temporal death. And in its being called the Letter, it is oppoſed to the Internal and Spiritual meaning of that Law, as it was the ſtrict Law and the Goſpel; and to this cleerer Diſpenſation of both the Law and Goſpel under Chriſt, and called the *Oldneſs of the Letter*, being the Old common way they had been taught by their Doctors, and educated in. For the Goſpel, and more Spiritual way of the *Moſaic-Law*, was New, and ſtrange to them (as you may perceive by *John* the Baptiſt's Doctrine of Repentance for the Remiſſion of ſins, being rejected by the *Phariſees*) as well as this cleer Diſpenſation under Chriſt, though that was the true way of Salvation from the beginning ever ſince mans fall.

5. The Law in this ſenſe, is ſaid *to kill*, and to be a Miniſtry of condemnation, though not only in this ſenſe, I ſuppoſe, but alſo in this ſenſe taken in Con-

Conjunction with the ſtrict Law of Works revealed in, by, and with this Law. It is ſaid *to kill, and condemn:* 1. Becauſe this Law did condemn with Temporal violent death, every one that did neglect any ſuch external Work whatſoever. But did not juſtifie to a proſperous life in *Canaan*, any but they that obſerved every *puntilio* of it. 2. Or rather, ſince the Apoſtle uſeth ſometimes to run the Law in the ſtrict-eſt ſenſe, exacting perfect Obedience, and the Law in this Political ſenſe together. The Law may be ſaid to condemn, and to be a Miniſtry of condemnation, becauſe the Law did as the Original ſtrict Law of Works in reality, though not in their Opinion, condemned every man that did not all whatſoever required; yea, that fail'd in obedience to any Internal command, and did alſo condemn as to Conſcience, all External failings, which they alſo held, but did not quicken, or revive, or juſtifie any as to Future-life; Not the Political Law, through it's own weakneſs and default, having no ſuch Promiſes to any performances whatſoever:

Not the Law in the ſtrict Conſcience-ſenſe through mans default, becauſe all are ſinners. 3. This Law taken ſtill conjunctly, may be ſaid to condemn, and kill men in another reſpect; Taken politically, it condemned men, and killed them as to Eternal death by occaſioning men, or rather, men taking occaſion by it, to go on in all Internal wickedneſs ſecurely, even to condemnation by the Law in a higher ſenſe; becauſe the Law in this Political ſenſe, never forbad thoſe ſins, that is, did not forbid them with its penalty of violent death, and they took occaſion hence, to think ſuch inward Impiety was not forbidden by the Law in any ſenſe, nor ſuch inward Piety required to their Salvation, (which may be the meaning of *Rom.* 7. 8, 11.) and ſo fell under Eternal condemnation, through the neglect of ſuch Piety. It proved to them a Miniſtry of condemnation in the event, through their own fault, they abuſing this ritual Political diſpenſation againſt the end and aim of it.

6. The Law alſo in this ſenſe, is ſaid to be-get Bondage and Baſeneſs, and Ser-

Servility of Spirit, even diſingenuous and unfilial Tempers; yet through their abuſe of this Political Law, making all that it required in this ſenſe to be all required of them. As for inſtance, How is it poſſible but the Popiſh Doctrines believed, ſhould produce and foment ſuch ſervility of Spirit, that place all neceſſary to Salvation in Externals, in the *opus operatum*, in Penances, and ſaying ſo many Prayers though by way of penalty, and undergone by them as ingrateful Penances; That teach, it is no matter for loving God, as ſome do expreſly; or Teach, as generally they do (which amounts to the ſame) That Attrition is enough for Pardon, and Salvation, without contrition, provided they have but the Prieſt's Abſolution joyned to their Attrition; explaining Attrition by trouble or affrightment for ſin, upon the account only of danger to our ſelves by it, without any ſorrow for ſin as an offence of a good God. So here we may without doubt ſay, that they that underſtood the Law, as requiring only ſuch External Obedience without Love, or any Internal, and ſo did perform

the External without any * love to God, which makes his Commands for being grievous, were void of filial ingenuous Diſpoſitions.

* Luke 11.42. *The* Phariſees *tithe Mint, &c. and paſs over Judgment and the love of God.* Obſerve, this Love is called Faith, *Mat.* 23 23. And by both, Faith and Love, is meant Internal worſhip.

Though I grant ſome Scriptures of the like import, may poſſibly be aplicable to the whole *Moſaic-Diſpenſation*, even as it was the Goſpel, as being a more ſervile and burthenſom way, by reaſon of the multitudes of the ritual commands which they were bound by it carefully to obſerve univerſally, which had no Intrinſical goodneſs in them to command them to right reaſon, and ingenuous lovers of God and Holineſs. But meerly the Authority of the Lawgiver, and ſo the motive to perform ſuch, could not but be comparatively to this Diſpenſation we live under, more eminently from fear in good men, as doing them becauſe they muſt do them; and not becauſe the doing them was that which a gracious heart would chuſe through Religion, and love to Holineſs,

to

to promote and increaſe Holineſs, the Image of God in his ſoul; which may be ſaid of almoſt all the Precepts under this preſent cleer Diſpenſation of the Goſpel; and ſo ſome ſuch Speeches may be underſtood comparatively, as I ſaid before, though I incline, you ſee, to Conſtrue them poſitively and abſolutely in the moſt places.

But now to conclude: *Firſt*, There was a ſenſe wherein the old Teſtament-Diſpenſation, and Law of *Moſes* was really, or held out really the ſtrict Law of Works as to Eternal concernments, threatning Future death to every ſin; And the Apoſtle indeed excludes any from being Juſtified, and affirms all to be condemned by it in this ſenſe, becauſe all are ſinners. But this is not ſaid to vaniſh away, for it remains in force unto this day; yea, and for the ſubſtance of it will do ſo to all Eternity. This is never affirmed to be Carnal, but is Spiritual; This indeed gives no life, though it was a Law to life; but that it gives none, is not through its own want or default, but through no mans performing the condition. This was no

Shadow, or Type, or beggarly Element.

Secondly, There was a Senſe, yea, and this was the chief Important ſenſe, wherein the Old Teſtament Diſpenſation, or Law of *Moſes*, was the Remedying-Law, or the Goſpel-promiſing Pardon as to Future-life, of all Tranſgreſſions of the Law, in the ſtrict ſenſe, upon Repentance and ſincere Endeavour, to obey all Gods Commands, Internal and External. The Apoſtle never ſpeaks againſt the Law in this ſenſe (however no way except comparatively to this cleerer Diſpenſation) but call's it the Promiſe, the Righteouſneſs of Faith, which He and other Apoſtle's Preached; The Promiſe, which was *Yea*, and *Amen*, in Chriſt. This is not ſaid to vaniſh away, but is made more clear in the Diſpenſation of of it under Chriſt. This was no Shadow nor Type, but the very Goſpel or Law of Grace, and Pardon it ſelf. The perfect Law of Grace converting the Soul, and giving life to men converted. This was the Law of Grace, that *Moſes*, *Samuel*, and *David*, yea, and

and the ſame for ſubſtance, that *Abraham* was juſtified and ſaved by: For it was this, That if men did ſincerely repent of their ſins, and believe Gods Teſtimonies, and Love, and Fear, and Serve God, and endeavour to do all God required of them, without alowing themſelves in any known ſin, they ſhould be ſaved notwithſtanding their ſins, and the Future puniſhment due to them by the Law in the ſtrict ſenſe; And this is the ſubſtance of the Goſpel, or Law of Grace now.

If it ſhould be asked, How cometh it to paſs, that the Author to the *Hebrews* ſhould uſe the words [The Law of *Moſes*, firſt Covenant-Teſtament and Law] in this Political, and not in this Conſcience-ſenſe? The account is eaſie, Becauſe his buſineſs in that Epiſtle, was againſt thoſe *Judaizers*, that would impoſe it on Chriſtians, to comply ſo far with the *Jews* (however to avoid Perſecution, For the *Jews* in thoſe days, were the chief Promoters of all their Perſecutions) as to keep the Law of *Moſes* in the ſenſe wherein it was now ceaſed, and they were not to keep it:

it: Therefore he taketh no notice of the Law in the Conſcience-ſence, wherein it was agreed by both (or however known to be held by him) to be incumbent on Chriſtians for the ſubſtance of it; but he in ſpeaking againſt the Law of *Moſes*, means, the Law of *Moſes* in that ſenſe wherein it was ceaſed, being but a Shadow, and ſhews that in this ſenſe it had only Temporal promiſes, and advantaged only to the purification of the Fleſh, and eſcaping Temporal calamities. Now to reply, it had alſo another ſenſe, would be true, but nothing to the purpoſe, ſince it had not in this ſenſe wherein he oppoſed it.

I ſuppoſe you now ſee, that it is far from Truth which this Author affirms, *viz.* That the Apoſtle *Paul* charges the whole *Moſaic-Diſpenſation*, with the defect of having no Promiſes of a Future-life.

I have taken liberty to ſpeak largely of theſe things, becauſe I know of none, that in my weak opinion, do ſpeak ſatisfactorily or truly of them; And I have much confidence that none can give any true tollerable Interpretation

tion of ſuch Paſſages of the Apoſtle's uſed in Derogation to the Law, without ſuch Notions and Diſtinctions of the Law, as I have here deſcribed and explained; and alſo I hope, that any one of ordinary abilities for ſuch things, may, holding to theſe Notions of the Law, give a rational and ſatisfactory account of the moſt Scriptures of ſuch derogatory import.

And now to go on with the Words of the Author, who having before told us, that the Apoſtle's Argument againſt Juſtification by the *Moſaic-Law*, was from the double defect of the whole *Moſaic-Law*, or Diſpenſation to ſanctifie men: Firſt, from an External defect, that it promiſed no Future-life. Now he comes to ſpeak of the Internal defect.

"Secondly, Another defect of the "Law, or *Moſaic-Diſpenſation*, is, "that it did not afford the Internal help "of the Holy Spirit. And it was in- "deed impoſſible, that men ſhould be "brought to Spiritual righteouſneſs, "or Holineſs by that Law, which nei- "ther gave, nor promiſed any aid of the "Spirit.

I will not ſpeak much here in anſwer to this, becauſe I have ſaid enough already, either here, or in another Diſcourſe.

Firſt, This is not an Argument made uſe of, as is here pretended.

Secondly, If they had no ability to perform Spiritual righteouſneſs, without the Spirits help, which was denied them, they were not bound to perform ſuch Spiritual obedience, ſince no man is bound to Natural impoſſibilities.

Thirdly, It is a weak manner of ſpeaking, though common to talk of it, being a defect of a Law not giving ability to perform it; no Law doth ſo, not that to *Adam*, or of *Moſes*, or of Chriſt, for every Law ſuppoſeth Ability (I mean the Natural ability) to obey it, or it could not oblige to Obedience, and ſo could be no Law to ſuch.

Fourthly, This is to ſay, that men could not ſin without the Grace of the Holy Spirit to enable them. For this Author grants, as well he may, that none are bound by any Law, to do what they have no power to do. But I have at large ſhewed in another Diſcourſe, the

the abſurdity of this Opinion, and that the gracious opperation of the Spirit, and the effect of it is ſomething that men can ſin without; And therefore, that men have the Natural power to obey ſome other way, and not from this, though not the Moral, but have this Moral power from this Grace of the Holy Spirit.

It cannot be pretended here, that this Author means, the *Moſaic-Law* afforded not the Spirit, to free men from the Moral impotency, of doing what they had the Natural power to do: For this would be to overthrow the thing he is pleading for, *viz.* The Impotency, and and Inſufficiency of the Law and Diſpenſation; Since Moral-impotency is nothing elſe but voluntary wickedneſs it ſelf; and would be to grant, there was no defect in the *Moſaic-Law* to Sanctifie, or Juſtifie, but it had all neceſſary naturally for theſe ends; but only the men were in fault, the men were ſo wicked they would not yield to, and obey it; and the Spirit did not actually make them willing of unwilling, obedient of diſobedient. But I refer ſuch

as

as do not understand what I here say, to my Discourse of Natural and Moral-impotency.

At last, the Author comes (having made, as he supposeth, apparent, what the Apostle's Arguments were, against Justification by the Law) to shew more expresly what Works of the Law they only were, that the Apostle excluded from Justification, in these words, and the following.

"Whosoever shall understand these things which we have spoken, (*viz.* In the prosecution of this Argument of the Apostle) "he may easily see, that "the Works which *Paul* simply excludeth from Justification, are such as "are performed by men without Gospel-Grace, by force of the *Mosaic-law* "or Law of Nature: For the things by "which *Paul* disputeth against the *Mosaic-Law*, do more strongly militate, "as we have noted somewhere, (*viz.* "*pag.* 120. before recited) against the "Law of Nature. Now this is an evident Consectary from what is before said. The Apostle fighteth with "this Argument, chiefly against Justifica-

"tion

"fication by the Law of *Moſes*, or Na-
"ture, that both theſe Laws are purely
"deſtitute of thoſe helps, by which a
"man may be drawn to true Holineſs
"worthy of God, and grateful to him.
"It manifeſtly hence follows, that on-
"ly that Holineſs, and thoſe Works
"are excluded by the Apoſtle from
"Juſtification, which proceed from
"a mans weak ability, [*ab infirmitate
"humana*] who is in the ſtate of the
"Law or Nature.

Firſt, Then no man was bound to true Holineſs acceptable to God, by the Law of *Moſes*, or the Law of Nature; and conſequently no man did ſin in not performing Obedience acceptable to God, ſince it was this defect of theſe Laws, neither of them either promiſing Future reward, or affording ability to perform true Godlineſs.

Secondly, I cannot underſtand, how this is conſiſtent with what this Author ſaith, *pag.* 116. before recited; where he affirmeth, that, "Some *Heathens* did
"ſincerely and heartily love and follow
"Virtue and Righteouſneſs, ſo far as
"it was known to them. Unleſs he
will

will say, that no Virtue and Righteousness pleasing to God, was known to them (which would be to make his concession insignificant) or that these *Heathens* did super-erogate, or did more than they had ability to do; or than the Law of Nature required from them.

Thirdly, This is to say, that the Apostle hath Copiously, and Elaborately, proved only these two things, *viz.* 1. That there is no Justification by good Works performed by men, provided there be no promise of Future reward made to them, or at least provided men to perform them without respect to Future recompence of reward. And 2. That no man is Justified by doing such Works, as men have in no sense any ability to do. Now can any imagine, that any of the *Jews* Pharisaical Teachers taught them, that they might be Justified by such Works.

If it shall be replied, No: For their Teachers taught them, that they might be Justified by the Works of the Law of *Moses* or Nature, which Works really had no promise of a Future-life reward, and they had really no ability to per-

perform theſe Works: But their *Phariſaical* Teachers taught them, That ſuch Works of the Law of *Moſes* had a promiſe of Future-life reward, and that they had ability to do ſuch Works.

I ſhall let many things paſs, that I might here rejoyn to ſhew the Inconſiſtency of this Reply, with the whole diſcourſe of the Apoſtle, yea, and with the Argument, he ſtrives to faſten on the Apoſtle; And alſo to ſhew how improbable it is, that men ſhould fancy themſelves to have, or believe others, telling them they have power to do things they have an Impotency to do; (taking Impotency as this Author apparently doth, for the proper natural Impotency, diſtinct from wickedneſs, for *a cannot*, diſtinct from *a will not*.) For it is not ordinary for Multitudes to fancy this, nor to believe them that ſhould tell them ſo, nor for any but wonderfully weak and fanciful men: Though I know it is too common for men, to have better thoughts of themſelves than they ſhould, in reference to their Morals, and ſo to think they are not ſo wicked as they are; and that they have

no Moral-Impotency (which is wicked Obſtinacy) to the doing thoſe good things, they have the Natural power to do. I ſay, letting theſe things paſs; And alſo, letting paſs what I could ſay, to prove that the Apoſtle would never have contradicted theſe Opinions, *viz.* That men might have been Juſtified, had they done all the Law of *Moſes*, or Nature, required of them; ſo as only wicked wilfulneſs (which is the Moral-Impotency) hindred them; becauſe neither thoſe, nor any other Laws whatſoever, required more than men have the Natural ability to do: And alſo paſſing by his mentioning of it as a defect in *Moſes* Law, and the Law of Nature, that they gave no ability to perform what they required: Whereas every Law ſuppoſeth ability to obey it, or it could not be a Law, or Obligatory, and therefore no Law giveeth or promiſeth the proper Ability to obey it ſelf.

I ſay, ſetting theſe things aſide, I ſhall only mind you how Inconſiſtent with themſelves (as well as with one another) both theſe Arguments are, which

which he pretends, are the Apoſtles two main (if not only) Arguments againſt Juſtification by Works of the Law of *Moſes*. I have ſhewed before, (in ſpeaking to it) the Inconſiſtency of the firſt Argument with it ſelf, which he ſaith, leaneth on two Foundations, *viz.* 1. That all men are guilty of great ſins, ſo that they cannot be Juſtified as to Conſcience, by the Law of *Moſes*. 2. That the Law of *Moſes* promiſed no Juſtification as to Conſcience, on any terms whatſoever; whereas one of theſe can only poſſibly be a reaſon, why they were not Juſtified by the Law of *Moſes*. For if that Law promiſed no Juſtification on any terms whatſoever, then their being ſinners, can be no reaſon why they were not Juſtified by that Law; And again, if their ſins were the reaſon why they were not Juſtified by the Law of *Moſes*, then the Law did promiſe Juſtification to them, on condition of their being free from ſuch ſins: So this ſecond Argument which he aſcribes to the Apoſtle (*viz.* That none could be Juſtified by the Law of *Moſes*, becauſe of two

Internal defects of the Law, which are, that it had no promise of Future-life Justification, and that they had no ability to do the things it required for their Future-life Justification) labours with the same ἀνεπεξία; For if they had no ability to do the things it required for their Future-life Justification, then their disability was the only cause of their not being Justified by that Law, and not the Laws not promising it: And again, if the Laws not promising it, was the reason why they could not attain Future-life Justification by that Law, then their disability to perform what it required, could be no cause of their not being Justified by it.

If any should reply, their disability was the cause why they could not perform true Piety; which true Piety was required by some other Law, for their Future-life Justification. Setting aside the Illogicalness, and Incoherency of Discourse, which this would fasten on the Apostle, in many particulars; I will only ask one so replying, By what Law was true Piety required of them? This Author tells us by the consequence (though possibly not expressly)

it

it was not required by the Law of *Moſes* or Nature; neither of them, as he ſaith, promiſing Future happineſs; and both being purely deſtitute of thoſe helps, whereby men might be drawn to true Piety, and conſequently by his Argument, none were bound to true Piety by them: If it ſhall be anſwered according to this Author, and ſome others, that true Piety was only required by the Goſpel: I have ſaid enough againſt this already, in ſhewing this Opinion would inevitably deſtroy Chriſts ſatisfaction, for any (though Partial, or Temporary) defect of true Piety. I ſhall further ask, Had the *Jews* under the Law of *Moſes* this Goſpel that required true Piety? Or had they it not? If they had not this Goſpel, either they then had ability to perform the true Piety required, or had not; If they had ability to perform it, then they had no need of this Law of *Moſes*, to promiſe Future-life Juſtification, or to give them ability for true Piety: If they had no ability to perform true Piety, which the Goſpel required of them. This is to ſay, the Goſpel required of the *Jews* what they had in no ſenſe any ability to do; which

this Author denies (as well he may, taking Ability in the ſtricteſt ſenſe) any Law of God to require. Yet, this Author here (forgetting himſelf I ſuppoſe) hath run himſelf into ſuch ſtraits, in affirming, the *Jews* could not perform true Piety without the Spirit, and that this Spirit was denied them; which is to ſay, they could not at all perform true Piety; That he muſt grant this of the Goſpel, or ſome Law, that it required what they had in no ſenſe any ability to do, (which without doubt is falſe) or he muſt deny, that God required any true Piety of them, by any Law whatſoever; which Evaſion I ſuppoſe, he will not make uſe of.

"From the whole Series of the A-"poſtles Diſputation, it is made ma-"niſeſt, that he only rejects ſuch works "from Juſtification, which if admit-"ted, may ſeem to yield to men mat-"ter of glorying, and boaſting them-"ſelves before God, *Rom.* 3. 27. and "4. 2. *Epheſ.* 2. 9. And who doth not "ſee, that that can only be ſpoken of "Works, which men do by their own "ability, without the help of Grace,

"For

"For it is manifeſt, that the Works "which men perform through the aſ- "ſiſtance of Grace, are owing to God, "and their glory redounds to Him, as "the higheſt and chiefeſt Author. "Theſe good Works which we per- "form, are not ſo much our Works, "as the Works of God himſelf in us. "And no man can rightly boaſt of that "thing which he ows to God.

I ſhall ere long take notice of this.

"*Pag.* 271. Since *Abraham*, in the "4*th. Chapter* to the *Romans*, is con- "ſidered by *Paul*, as the Father of the "Faithful, and the great Exemplar of "the Juſtification of all juſtified ones; "It is impoſſible but the ſpeech of the "Apoſtle concerning his Juſtification, "ſhould give great light to this whole "Diſpute concerning Juſtification.

This is well obſerved, therefore I ſhall diligently attend to this.

This Author begins to give largely the meaning of the firſt *Verſes* of the fourth to the *Romans*, *pag.* 264. which ſpeak of *Abraham*'s Juſtification; And proceeds well for ſubſtance to *ver.* 3. only he affirms that theſe words [*ac-*

cording to the flesh] in the first *Verse*, and [*by the Law*] in the second *Verse*, (which he grants do both signifie the same thing) do signifie Works done by a mans own power (that is, without a promise of Future reward, and without the help of Gods Spirit) which I see no evidence of, but have told you my thoughts, that these words signifie perfect and unsinning Obedience, or meritorious Works.)

But now *ver.* 3. For what saith the Scripture, *Abraham* believed God, and it was accounted (or imputed) to him for Righteousness. (Here saith he well.) "This Citation of Scripture is brought "to prove the words in the *verse* be- "fore, *viz.* That *Abraham* in the bu- "sinesse of Justification, had nothing "to boast of before God; And the A- "postle gathereth it thus, That the re- "ward was imputed to *Abraham* not of "debt, as a reward useth to be given "to workers, but of meer Grace; And "therefore *Abraham* had no cause to "boast before God, of any thing in the "matter of his Justification. Thus far well. He goes on *verbatim* thus: "But "how

"how doth the Apostle gather this Pag. 264.
"from the words cited. I answer:
"Some think that this Argument is pla-
"ced in the word ἐλογίσθη, was accoun-
"ted, or imputed, as if the word sig-
"nified graciously accepting, or ac-
"counting according to Grace and Fa-
"vour; and that it signifies accounting
"or rewarding according to Debt, ei-
"ther never, or very Improperly.
"Whence *Erasmus* Interpreteth the
"word, *acceptum fert*; adding, *Est*
"*autem acceptum ferre, pro accepto ha-*
"*bere quod non acceperis, quæ apud*
"*Jureconsultos, ni fallor, vocatur ac-*
"*ceptilatio.* That is, the word impu-
"ted it self; signifies such a Law ac-
"ceptation, as when one grants he hath
"received a thing, and acquits as if he
"had received it, when indeed he hath
"not received it. Many most learned Pag 265.
"Interpreters, follow this Interpreta-
"tion of *Erasmus*, thus forming the
"Apostles Argument.

"If the reward had been given to
"*Abraham* of debt, it would not have
"been said, God Imputed Righteous-
"ness unto him: For Imputation de-

notes

"notes gracious and free Donation.
"But the Scripture saith, God Imputed
"Righteousness to *Abraham*. Ergo,
"*&c.*

"But this Interpretation doth not
"please me, since it is manifest from
"the Scriptures, that the word חשב,
"used in the Old Testament, and also
"the word λογίζομαι, used by the Apo-
"stle in the *Greek*, and which answer-
"eth to the *Hebrew* word, are used
"concerning the Imputation of a thing
"to (or for) sin, 2 *Sam.* 19. 19.
"which every one will grant is Imputa-
"tion in Justice; yea, and the same
"word often signifies in Scripture, a true
"and just Estimation, and Judgment
"of a thing, *Deut.* 2. 11, 20. And it
"is too manifest, that the Apostle him-
"self in the very next verse, *ver.* 4.
"uses this very word, *for rewarding*
"*according to debt.* Therefore this
"Argument of the Apostle whereby
"he infers from the Text cited, that
"the Justification of *Abraham* was
"meerly Gracious, cannot lean upon
"the naked signification of the word
"ἐλογίσθη, that is, Accounted, or

Im-

"Imputed, or Reckoned.

Since this Objection hath a colourable ſhew, and the right Interpretation of this Chapter, *Rom.* 4. doth depend wholly upon it (as I have ſhewed in a ſhort Diſcourſe of the Apoſtles meaning) and ſince many Learned men are perplexed ſo with this difficulty, as to be driven to Interpret this place otherwiſe than right, thinking the very word doth not ſignifie Accounting of Grace and Favour, and ſo that the Apoſtle's Argument cannot lean on this word; And ſince none that I know of, have attempted to Anſwer it, I ſhall ſpeak largely in Anſwer to this, that I may ſpeak ſatisfactorily.

I know the *Hebrew* and *Greek* words in diſpute, are *Polyſema*, have divers ſignifications; (juſt as the *Engliſh* word Account alſo hath) For they ſignifie properly, and in the firſt ſenſe, meerly the immanent Acts of the Underſtanding, as to Think, Eſteem (as alſo the immanent acts of valewing, computing Sums together, deviſing, inventing, though not ſo primarily:) Now when theſe words are uſed in this ſenſe,

ſenſe, they may be according to the reality and truth of things, or not according to the reality or truth of things. If there be an Accounting, or Eſteeming, in this ſenſe, not according to the reality and truth of things, it is an errour of the Underſtanding, and a fault or weakneſs (though it can neither be an Act of Kindneſs, or Severity) and ſo cannot be aſcribed to God; his Judgment, and counting, and valuation in this ſenſe, being always according as things are.

But the words cannot have this proper ſenſe here, as is apparent, for imputing Righteouſneſs, is either an Act of Mercy, or Juſtice: For Acts of Juſtice and Mercy, belong not to the Underſtanding, nor are Acts of that; for they proceed from the Will; and are not neither meer immanent Acts of the Will, but tranſient Acts proceeding from it, and cauſed by it. Therefore let this proper and moſt common uſe of the words paſs, as not capable of being meant in ſuch Speeches.

Sometime theſe words are uſed, not for Acts of the Underſtanding, as I ſaid; But for the Rectoral tranſient Acts

Acts of Rewarding, or Puniſhing, of dealing Kindly, or Severely; Graciouſly, or Juſtly. For theſe words, when uſed of ſuch tranſient Acts, are capable of either of theſe ſignifications; and which of the ſignifications they have in particular places, is known readily by ſeeing whether it be ſome good or evil, that is reckned, or imputed, or whether it be ſome good or evil thing that is not reckned or not Imputed. But, let theſe words, when uſed in this Rectoral Law-ſenſe, be uſed in whether of the ſenſes they will, (*viz.* of doing Juſtly, or Merciſully; Severely, or Graciouſly) yet this is true of them, that they always ſignifie the accounting or imputing ſomething that is not in reality the thing, that it is accounted or imputed for; but only by a kind of Law Conſtruction, or Acceptilation; or the not accounting, or not imputing the thing that is that in reality, which it is not accounted, or not imputed for. Now if this be true, (which I ſhall after make appear, by producing all the places of Scripture, where the word is uſed in any ſenſe, different from a meer Act of the Underſtanding)

ing) then it follows, that when ever we read of Imputing, or accounting to a man, a thing that is a good thing (as here Righteouſneſs or Reward) then it is an act of Grace or Law acceptilation and kindneſs, and that God might juſtly have done otherwiſe; becauſe the word Implys, a man had not that Righteouſneſs, that perfect Innocency, that was accounted to him; And alſo when ever we read of God's not Imputing, or not accounting that which is evil to a man (as Sin, Iniquity) then it was an act of Kindneſs, or Grace, becauſe the very word Implys, *the man had that ſin, had done that evil*, that was not accounted to him.

Now to make it appear, that theſe words when they do not ſignifie a meer immanent Act of the underſtanding, but are uſed in the ſenſe of doing good or evil, kindly or ſeverely, yet they always ſignifie the accounting ſomething that is not, or not accounting ſomething that is the thing reſpectively, as I have ſaid.

Firſt, Let theſe Scriptures be conſidered, wherein the words are uſed in the

the Penal, or Inimical ſenſe, and not in the Benigne, rewarding favourable ſenſe, *Lev.* 7. 18. Where, ſpeaking of a mans Peace-offering, *It is commanded, that he eat all he eats of it in two days, and burn the reſt with fire; If any of it be eaten by the man on the third day, the Offering ſhall not be accepted, neither ſhall it be imputed to him that offereth it.* That is, though he did offer indeed this Offering; yet, this Offering for an offence committed three days after, ſhall be null and void, for any benefit coming to the man by it, even as if he had not offered it at all; not that Godwill account that in reality, he did not offer it. So *Lev.* 17. 4. *If any man kill a Beaſt in Sacrifice, and bring it not to the door of the Tabernacle, Blood ſhall be imputed to that man, he hath ſhed Blood, and he ſhall be cut off from among the people.* That is, he ſhall be accounted in Law a Murtherer, Murther ſhall be Imputed to him, *viz.* He ſhall in judgment of Law, be accounted a Murtherer, ſo far that the ſame puniſhment ſhall be due to him, and Inflicted on him that would have been due, if he had commit-

mitted Murther; not that he had in reality, or was esteemed in reality to have shed Humane blood, *Philemon, vers.* 18, 19. where there is a word near akin to this, but not altogether the same. *If he have wronged, or oweth thee any thing* ὀφείλει, *Impute it, Account it to me, I will pay it.* Not that he did owe it, or had wronged him; or that he would have him count that in reality he had wronged him, or ought it to him; but require it of me: I put my self into that state in reference to Law, as if I did owe it, or had wronged thee.

Secondly, Consider these following Scriptures, where these words are used in the favourable Rewarding-sense, *2 Tim.* 4. 16. *I pray God this* (viz. fault) *may not be imputed, or accounted to them.* That is, I pray it may be pardoned, that it may be accounted as if it had not been committed) not that he pray's God, to think really that they never committed the fault; which would be to admit an errour into his understanding; but that he would graciously pardon it, and consequently no more punish it, than if he judged it not com-

committed, *Numb.* 18. 27, 30. *This your Heave-offering ſhall be accounted or imputed to you, as the Corn of the Threſhing-floor.* That is, whereas the people are commanded to offer their Tithes, and their firſt-Fruits to God, or they cannot without Sin and a Curſe, enjoy the reſt; Now ſaith he to the *Levites*, If you pay this part, the giving of this ſhall by Gods favour be available in Law, to your benefit and comfort, in freeing you from a Curſe, in imploying all the reſt to your own uſe, as if you had given ſuch Tithes, and Firſt-fruits of your own Husbandry, as the people do. Not that God would account it really the Corn of their own Threſhing-floor, the Firſt-fruits of their own Husbandry, *Rom.* 5. 13. Where a different word is uſed, but next a-kin to this. *Sin is not imputed where there is no Law.* That is, could one ſuppoſe *per poſſibile, vel impoſſibile*, that there ſhould be ſin committed by a man without a Law, it would not be Imputed, he would not be guilty, obliged to ſuffer, would not be treated as an Offender, *Rom.* 4. 11. *That Righteouſneſs*

might be imputed to them (viz. the *Gentiles*) *also.* That is, That though they be sinners, and so have not Innocence and Righteousness in reality, yet it shall upon their becoming Christians, be Imputed to them, *Rom.* 2. 26. *If the uncircumcised keep the righteousness of the Law, his uncircumcision shall be accounted for circumcision.* That is, though a man be not Circumcised, and so be one that you much despise, yet if he live holily, he shall be respected by God to all intents and purposes, as if he had been Circumcised, *Rom.* 4. 8. cited out of *Psal.* 32. *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute iniquity, implying there is iniquity, but he will pardon it, and not impute it*; Interpreted by that, his sin forgiven; therefore it Implys there is sin, but not Imputed. Not that God accounts he never committed it.

These words are also used in the Scriptures following, but are used in something a different sense from the words fore cited; because, as you may observe, they are not capable of being Translated by the word Impute, as these

above

above mentioned all are, *viz. Job* 33. 10. *Chap.* 19. 11. *Chap.* 13. 24. *He counteth me for his enemy*, Gen. 31.15. *Are we not accounted of him ſtrangers*, Job 19. 15. *My Maidens accounted me for a ſtranger*, Hoſ. 8. 12. *I have written to them, the wonderful things of my Law, but they were accounted ſtrange things*, Pſal. 44.22. cited Rom.8.36. *We are accounted as ſheep for the ſlaughter.* Now this may apparently be ſaid of theſe Scriptures, that either the word ſignifies a meer Thinking, a meer immanent Act of the Underſtanding without any thing of favour, or diſfavour, as one may Interpret ſome of theſe places; or if not, they apparently imply, as any may perceive upon conſidering the places, that the thing was not ſo in reality as accounted. It would be too high in me to ſay, I am certain (upon ſo little pains as I have taken to examine) theſe are all; yet, I am very confident theſe are all the places of Scripture, where the *Hebrew* or *Greek* words, are uſed in any ſenſe diſtinct from a meer immanent Act of the Underſtanding, except that of *Phinees*

executing Judgement, and it was accounted to him for Righteousnes, and the same words repeated again by this Apostle, and by Saint *James*, which are plain to this sence; and the two Scriptures which this Author cites, that I shall now take notice of.

This Author refers us only to two Scriptures, where the words do not signifie meer thinking, to prove that the words are used for accounting, according to Justice, and not Grace, or according to the reality of things: But they both of them prove evidently against that which he produceth them to prove.

The first is that saying of *Shimei*, 2 Sam. 19. 19. *Let not the King impute iniquity to me, neither do thou remember what thy servant did perversly.* Here saith he, Imputation of sin is of Justice and not of Grace. *Answ.* He forgets there is a Negation in this Speech. It is not, *let my Lord impute iniquity to me*; But, *let not my Lord impute iniquity*. Now, not to impute Iniquity, is the very same thing with imputing Righteousnes, as the Apostle shews in this

this Chapter, *ver.* 6, 8. compared. Imputing Righteousness without Works, that is, without a mans being Righteous; and not imputing Iniquity where there is Iniquity, are the same. *Shimei*'s meaning is, though I have committed a great fault, and in truth am guilty, and unrighteous in this respect, yet impute Righteousness to me through Grace by pardon, as to this fault; or do not impute Iniquity to me; put me into that state in reference to Punishment for this fault, as if I was Righteous, or Innocent as to this fault; as if the fault had never been committed. He did not mean, do thou really account I never did that fault, or do thou in Justice, and not in Favour, not impute sin to me.

The other Scripture which he brings, is as manifest against him as this is, which is this, *viz. ver.* 4. the very next *verse* after this; Abraham *believed, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness. Now to him that worketh, the reward is reckoned of debt, and and not of Grace.* Here, saith he, the Apostle himself useth the word *reckoned,*

ned, for reckned of Debt: And therefore, the word *reckned*, doth not ſignifie reckned of Grace, of it ſelf.

Anſw. It is ſo apparent, that any one may ſee it by peruſing the place; That theſe words [*Now to him that worketh, the reward is reckned of Debt, and not of Grace*] are an Argument to prove ſomthing ſaid before, as appears by the word δὲ, Tranſlated, *Now*; and do lean upon this implied Foundation, to make them Argumentative, *viz.* That ſo the word *reckned* cannot ſignifie, when he ſaith, God accounted it to him for Righteouſneſs, but ſignifies accounted it of Grace. The Apoſtle's Argument, is this. If the reward had been given to *Abraham* for his Works, as being a righteous man in the ſtrict ſenſe, free from all ſin, or failing in obedience; it would not have been ſaid, that God imputed Righteouſneſs to him, which implies his being deſtitute of it: And he proves the conſequence thus, *For to him that worketh*, that is, that Meriteth, or is Righteous by his own works, the reward is accounted of Debt, and not of Grace; and ſo it leans

leans upon this, as being a thing apparent in it self, that so the word Accounted cannot signifie, but signifies accounted it of Grace and Favour, imputed righteousness to one not righteous, like not imputing sin, to one which implys the man a sinner. And the Apostle in the following *verse* shews, that it is all one as if it had been said, *Abraham believed God, and upon his believing, God did not impute sin to him.* And saith, that if the Idolatrous unrighteous *Gentiles* believe as he did, Righteousness shall be imputed to them, or sin shall not be imputed to them. Suppose we had read expresly these words [*Shimei* repented, or confessed his fault, and *David* imputed it to him for Righteousness] would it not have been all one as to say, *David* did upon the Repentance, or Confession of *Shimei*, not impute sin to him; And would it not be the same as to say, *David* pardoned *Shimei* upon his Repentance or Confession; and would not all these words [*imputed Righteousness, imputed not Sin, and Pardoned*] equally imply *Shimei* was a sinner, or one unrighteous,

and consequently an Act of grace and favour, in *David* so to do.

The Author having, as you have seen, given us his reason why he cannot be of their mind, that say the word implys *reckoned of Grace*. He in the next words tells us, how the Apostle gathers out of that Scripture [*Abraham believed God, and it was counted or imputed to him for Righteousness*] that the reward was not imputed to *Abraham* of Debt, as a reward is given to Labourers, but of Grace. Thus,

Pag. 265. "I judg therefore, that the Collection of the Apostle, whereby he "infers out of that Citation; That the "Justification of *Abraham* was meerly "Gratuitous, doth not lean upon the "naked signification of the word [*was "Imputed*]; But partly upon the nature of the thing, which is said to be "Imputed to *Abraham* for Righteousness, and partly on the former state "and quality of the person, *Abraham*; "to whom it is said to be Imputed.

Pag. 266. "*First*, The nature of the thing, "The thing which is said to be Imputed to *Abraham* for Righteousness,

"was

"was Faith and Obedience ſpringing
"from it. Now the obedience of
"Faith, doth exclude, all Merit all to-
"gether in its own Notion: For the
"obedience of Faith, ſuppoſeth a gra-
"cious Revelation of God, firſt made
"to the Believer, and ſo ſuch Promiſes
"as do by their own excellency, ſtrong-
"ly excite a man believing them, to
"perform that obedience to God, by
"which, as by the condition, the good
"things Promiſed are to be attained,
"and ſuch Promiſes as do not only e-
"qual, but far excel the whole labour
"(though very great) which is under-
"taken through the belief of them.
"So it was plainly in the Example of
"*Abraham*. He indeed believed God,
"but firſt God had revealed himſelf to
"him in a gracious extraordinary man-
"ner, *Acts* 7. 2, 3. He had obeyed
"the Divine command, in calling him
"to a long perilous Journey; but God
"had added Wings to his Journey,
"promiſing ſuch huge good things,
"which might even fill a decriped old
"man with youthful ſtrength, and might
"animate him to bear any trouble
"cheer-

"cheerfully. Whatſoever therefore
"*Abraham* did worthy of praiſe, he
"ought to aſcribe it to the gracious
"Revelation, and the liberal Promiſes
"made to him by God of his meer
"Mercy, therefore there was no occa-
"ſion for *Abraham* to glory, No Me-
"rit.

"The Apoſtle ſeems to have reſpect
"to this, *ver.* 5. where, when that
"which was denied of one working,
"(*viz.* the reward to be given him of
"Grace) * was to have been repeated
"in the following Oppoſition, and to
"have been affirmed of one believing
"thus, [*but to a man believing, the
"reward is reckned of Grace:*] But the
"Apoſtle doth quite otherwiſe, ſaith he,
"to one believing his faith is imputed
"for righteouſneſs, as if he ſhould ſay,
"upon that very account that his faith
"is imputed for righteouſneſs, his Juſti-
"fication is meerly gracious, ſince Faith
"in it ſelf ſounds forth Grace, and ex-
"cludes Merit.

* This is his miſtake, and not the Apoſtle's

"Here now I muſt (but as on the
"bie) a little dwell upon the words of
"the Apoſtle, *ver.* 4. *To him that work-*
"*eth,*

Pag. 267.

" *eth, the reward is not reckned of Grace*
" *but of Debt.* Which place, that it
" may be the better underſtood, two
" things are to be enquired. 1. What
" the word *working* ſignifies? 2. What
" the word *Debt* ſignifies? For the
" firſt, He that worketh, denoteth him
" that worketh of himſelf, and by his
" own ſtrength, being aſſiſted with no
" Divine aids. For he that worketh by
" the Grace of God, he doth not ſo much
" work as the Grace of God in him,
" 1 *Cor.* 15. 10. *Gal.* 2. 20. And the
" Context of the place confirms this;
" For beſide that the Apoſtle (as we
" have ſeen) doth profeſſedly diſpute
" of the works of *Abraham*, which he
" performed according to the fleſh, in
" the beginning of the *Chapter*; That
" is alſo chiefly to be obſerved, that
" he that worketh, is oppoſed to him
" that believeth; that is, that from the
" belief of the Divine Promiſes, and
" ſo whoſe works are to be aſcribed to
" the Divine Grace, which ſtirred him
" up to work with moſt great and liberal
" Promiſes, alſo adding a great effica-
" cy of his Spirit, which alſo is recei-
" ved

"ved only after and by Faith.
"Now in the second place, to speak
"of these words [*of Debt*] no reason
"permits that they
"should be taken
"rigidly & *strict-
"ly. For the re-
"ward of Eternal
"life, cannot be
"said properly to
"be owing to any
"man, though
"working most
"perfectly, and al-
"so from the meer
"strength of Nature. Neither could
"that be ascribed to the first man if he
"had stood in Innocency, and had ne-
"ver violated the Divine Covenant
"with any sin; for the reward of Eter-
"nal life being Infinite, exceeds infi-
"nitely the works of any Creature.
"Therefore it is most certain, that these
"words of the Apostle, [*But to him
"that worketh, the reward is not recko-
"ned of Grace, but of Debt,*] are not
"to be understood absolutely and sim-
"ply, but comparatively: So that,
"the

*There is all reason to take words strictly and properly, when it can be done, and not to fly to this Authors expression, [*it may seem as it were of Debt.*] And had this Author given the true sense of this Chapter, he might have taken the words strictly; thus, If of perfect obedience to the Law, then of Debt, and not of Grace, meaning by Grace, Forgiveness; and if of meritorious Works, then of Debt, and not of Grace, in any sense.

"the Apoſtle ſignifies, that the reward
"is not given to him that worketh on
"that manner, as I have expreſſed, out
"of ſuch meer and pure Grace, as to one
"that believeth; that is, to one work-
"ing from Faith. Therefore, this is
"the ſenſe of the words. If the re-
"ward of Eternal life ſhould be given
"by God to him that worketh; that is,
"that obeys God, and worketh righ-
"teouſneſs by his native ſtrength with-
"out the Grace of God: That may
"really ſeem as it were to be given as of
"debt, and there would be to one work-
"ing, at leaſt ſome ſhew of boaſting.
"But when the reward is imputed to
"him that doth not work, but believeth;
"that is, who works nothing of him-
"ſelf, but from Faith, and after his be-
"lieving of God graciouſly revealing
"himſelf. Here appears Divine Grace
"illuſtriouſly; boaſting is excluded,
"all merit is caſt off: Yea, here is
"ſeen double Grace of God. 1. That
"he works in a man the obedience of
"Faith by his Grace, preceding all
"Merits of his; and alſo, that he impu-
"teth for Righteouſneſs, the ſame obe-

"dience

" dience to a man which he wrought in " him, and Crowning it with a great " Reward, no otherwiſe than if the man " had performed it of himſelf.

Whereas this Author pretends, that the ſtreſs of the Apoſtles Argument in *Rom.* 4. leans upon this, *viz.* That if men ſhould do things they have in no ſenſe any ability to do; and that in *ſenſu compoſito*, while they have no ability to do them: If men ſhould do that by their native ſtrength, which they have no ſtrength to do; this would Merit, or have ſome ſhew of Merit. As if *Abraham* had believed before God had promiſed, had believed without a Teſtimony or Revelation, or had obeyed before he had any ability to obey; this would have Merited, or have had ſome ſhew of Merit: But God promiſed firſt before *Abraham* believed, and afforded him ſtrength and all things naturally neceſſary to produce obedience before he obeyed, and ſo there was no Merit in his Faith and Obedience. I confeſs I am dubious whether I ſhould grant this to be true, or not; or if I ſhould grant it true, whether I

ſhould

ſhould deny any ſuch Suppoſitions may be allowed in Argumentation, ſince it would require many words exactly to determine this Logical diſpute, and would alſo require more Logical acuteneſs, than he or I in theſe diſputes ſeem to make uſe of, or is fit in this Controverſie to trouble the Reader with. But to be ſhort, I will grant, but it ſhall be only conditionally; That this would Merit, or have a ſhew of Merit, becauſe it would be to do what God gave him no ability to do; yea, it would be to do what all generally grant that the Diety cannot do, *viz.* a formal Impoſſibility. But I will grant it, as I ſaid only conditionally, *viz.* on condition that he will grant the contrary, follows from the ſame Suppoſition, *viz.* That if a man ſhould do what he hath no ability to do, it would have no Merit, or no ſhew of Merit, becauſe it would be ſo far from Merit, that it would be an abſurd, irrational, and fooliſh act; it would be ſo far from any ſhew of Merit, that it could no way be commendable. And becauſe ſome may think ſtrange of ſuch a conditional conceſſion, let it be conſider-

ſidered, that from a naturally impoſſible Suppoſition (as this of his is) contradictory Conſequences may equally follow, as I could make appear, in almoſt any Inſtance: Take theſe, *Si ſcirem me mortuum eſſe eſſem mortuus:* And, *Si ſcirem me mortuum eſſe non eſſem mortuus.* If I truly knew I was not, I ſhould not be: And if I truly knew I was not, I ſhould be.

So, *Si beſtia intelligeret eſſet homo: Si beſtia intelligeret non eſſet homo.* Therefore, what Irreverence is it, at the leaſt, for this Author to faſten ſuch an Argument on the Apoſtle, as that either nothing can be concluded from it, or the contrary may equally be concluded from it? *e.g.* If *Abraham* had been Juſtified by Works, that is (according to this Author) by doing ſuch works as he had in no ſenſe any power to do, he might glory, or he had Merited; when it might as well at leaſt be concluded, he could not have gloried, he could not have Merited. But yet to prevent the *Antinomian* Extreme, who uſe to ſay, we muſt not ſo much as Suppoſe things, or Argue from

Sup-

Suppoſitions, though only Morally impoſſible; remember I put in the word [*Naturally*,] ſaying, [*Suppoſitions Naturally impoſſible.*] For it is apparent, there may be rational Arguing from a *Hypothetical* propoſition, which is not Naturally impoſſible, but only Morally. As for Example, in ſuch Speeches as theſe; If a man not Elected, or to whom God did not Decree to give converting Grace, ſhould Believe and Repent, he ſhould be Saved: If a man accuſtomed to do evil, ſhould do well, he ſhould be Saved: If a man had turned from ſin to God, before God converted him, it would have prevented many ſad Thoughts of Heart. Yea, this may ſo evidently be ſuppoſed, that men's Hearts may and do reproach them, that they did not turn to God before God did actually turn them; or did give them ſuch Grace as would actually prevail with them; becauſe, before God did thus turn them, or give them the Grace of Converſion, they had the Natural ability to Convert and turn to God, and only their Moral-Impotency, which is voluntary Wickedneſs,

hindred them; elſe it would not have been their duty ſo to turn, or their ſin not to turn. So, *Paul* ſaith, *If an Angel of Heaven ſhould Preach any other Goſpel, he ſhould be accurſed.* And Chriſt ſaid, *John* 8. 55. *If I ſhould ſay, I know him not, I ſhould be a lyar like to you*: And theſe are rationally allowable Suppoſitions; becauſe an Angel in Heaven hath, and Chriſt on Earth had, the Natural power to Speak or Teach falſhood; though yet joyned with ſuch a Morally inſuperable holy rectitude of Will, that they could not obtain of themſelves ſo to Speak or Teach. And this is not like doing what they have not the Natural ability to do; And the contrary doth not here follow from theſe Suppoſitions: For you cannot ſay, If a confirmed Angel from Heaven ſhould Teach errour, he ſhould not be accurſed; or if Chriſt ſhould have denied he knew God, he would not have been a Lyar; which yet might have been ſaid, if this had been, To do, what they had not the Natural power to do; becauſe then, ſo to Teach or Speak, would neither have been

been Laudable nor Culpable, and ſo not formally a Lye, nor a cauſe of being accurſed. Neither can you ſay, if a non-Elect man had believed, he had not been ſaved. My diſcourſe of *Natural and Moral-Impotency*, will make what I here ſay, more plain to you.

This Author ſpeaks often, and particularly here of the neceſſity of Grace, and of mans Diſability to do any good, without the Grace of the Holy Spirit; which may much puzle men not verſed in ſuch Diſcourſes: And the knowing what he means by the word GRACE, would do much to ſhew further the Inconſiſtency of the Argument, from a defect of Internal Grace, which he pretends the Apoſtle makes uſe of. Now, though the Author ſpeak not much Explicitly, to tell us what he means by this Grace, and what the effect of it is; yet thus much is apparent from the conſtant Tenor of his Diſcourſe, that he goes the common Remonſtrant way, and holds that the Effect of it is, The giving that Internal power or ability, that men could not

be inexcuſable in not obeying the Goſpel without: and whoſoever doth ſo, may be forced (by a little Argumentation, as I have elſe-where made apparent) though againſt his will, to confeſs, that he means no more by it, than God's giving men that enjoy the Goſpel, the very power or faculty of free-will in *actu ſecundo*, without which, they could not ſin, or be ſound men, or men in their right wits. Yea, all that ever I have read of that way, do apparently mean no more by Grace, (not ſo much as thoſe by ſome-admired Letters of Doctor *Hammond*, in anſwer to the Lord Biſhop *Sanderſon*, excepted;) though ſome pretend a great ſatisfactorineſs in the Scheme there propounded, as if it avoided the common inconveniences that Way is Clogged with. For there the Learned Doctor, though he ſeems cautelous to hide his meaning, in calling it a Supernatural power to believe and obey the Goſpel; yet it will appear plain enough, that he means by it no more than the very Power and Faculty of Free-will, to any Intelligent man that ſhall conſider theſe his Aſſertions following concerning it. *Firſt*,

First, He holds, that if this Grace of the Holy Spirit, or this Grace of Conversion was denied men that enjoy the Gospel, they would be excusable, *pag.* 34. that is, They could not be guilty of sinning against, or disobedience to the Gospel (for nothing that is truly sin is excusable.) Yea, he supposes still consonantly to this, that if it should be denied any man in this life, enjoying the Gospel, as he thinks it was to *Pharaoh*, such a one would be as one naturally dead; even from under the command of Obedience to the Gospel: For his non-obedience in this case, would be imputable to God, *pag.* 94. 95.

I grant, that if God had totally deprived *Pharaoh* of the Natural power of obeying his Calls, *viz.* By depriving him of the right Natural use of his Faculties, by making him a Natural Fool; then his Non-conversion, and Non-obedience to the Divine Command after such deprival, would, as the Doctor saith, have been imputable to God; and therefore his Non-obedience in such a case, would have been no sin, but wholly excusable; because

imputable to God. But that a man having the faculties to understand, and do Gods Commands, should not be to blame in not doing such Commands, except God give him the Internal grace of his Spirit, is strange Discourse, though too common.

Secondly, He affirms, that Grace doth not give To will to any, or take away unwillingness or resistency of will from any, any farther than by meerly giving Power or Ability to comply with the Gospel, *pag.* 55. And expresses his dislike of it, as a meer conceit for any to hold, that, Grace causeth actual willingness, or taketh away unwillingness to good, any further than by meerly giving power to the Will to obey and comply with the Gospel, which Grace gives to all enjoying the Gospel.

Thirdly, If it should be granted, that God doth any more towards any man's Conversion that enjoys the Gospel, than give this Power without which men would not be Inexcusable in not obeying it, which he calls sufficient Grace, (as he supposes God may do

some

ſome ſingular External thing providentially for ſome, as by afflicting them, though no ſingular Internal thing by his Spirit) he then ſuppoſes, that what is done more for any man, than this degree of Grace ſufficient to render men inexcuſable, is not an effect of Grace properly ſo called, or to be ſaid to proceed from Supernatural grace. Whereas I ſhould ſay, that giving that ability without which men could in no ſenſe obey the Goſpel, is to be called an effect of Juſtice, and not of Grace; ſo that God cannot in Juſtice condemn men for not obeying the Goſpel, if he did not give them ſo much power as to make them inexcuſable in not obeying it; which if true, there would be nothing left to be called Internal-grace, in the converſion of one enjoying the External or Objective evidence, the Goſpel, according to his Principles.

Moreover, the Doctor affirms conſentaneous to the ſame Principle, That Mans reſiſting, and refuſing to comply with the Goſpel, is the only reaſon of the difference of men that enjoy the Goſpel, that one is Converted, and an-

other not, and not Grace any further than by graciously giving this power of willing to obey, or power of not resisting the Gospel, which is given also to those that are not Converted: And he pretends, that he yet keeps up the honour of Grace in Conversion, by saying, that though one mans chusing when others refuse to comply with the Gospel, cometh only from the former well-disposedness of the man, and his preceding willingness to do Gods Will, which the other wanted; yet this chusing the good, when others refuse, cannot be ascribed only to Free-will, because this well-disposedness of the man proceeded from former preventing Grace. Now, cannot any man that is not of a forlorn understanding see, that this doth not avoid the Consequence he pretends it doth avoid? while he makes this preventing Grace the same; or however no more than the Subsequent, by holding that neither Preventing, nor Subsequent Grace, do any more towards Conversion, than meerly give the power, and do not in the least cause the well-disposedness of any man, any further than meer-

meerly by giving a man a power ſo far to obey the Goſpel, as to be able to be wrought on to this well-diſpoſedneſs, which alſo was equally given to others? And to hold, that God did cauſe this Towardlineſs, and good Diſpoſition, and Malleableneſs, and Willingneſs to obey the Goſpel, (which he ſo much inſiſts on) by doing for ſuch men more than he did for others, that have no ſuch Temper wrought in them, would be but, at the moſt (if ſo much) a running the Controverſy a little further, by running a little way from the *Anti-Remonſtrant*, and then ſtanding ſtill and yeilding to him; by yielding, that God by his Spirit doth more in Converſion, than meerly give ability to the will to chuſe or refuſe, and doth actually cauſe the difference; And that the cauſe of to be ones thus differing from another, is aſcribed to ſome ſpecial Grace and Favour, conſiſting in doing ſomthing for one he did not for the other, and that unconditionately, or without reſpect to any precedent leſs illneſs, or more goodneſs of his; which is the thing theſe Letters mainly oppoſe. And if it appear

pear, that God doth thus in time, it will readily be granted by him, he decreed to do so from Eternity, as appears fully by his Orthodox and judicious Letters, annexed to these concerning Præscience.

And whereas he grants, that if this well-disposednes of the man (which he saith is the only reason of the Conversion of one enjoying the Gospel, when others go on Unconverted) was not wrought by Grace, this would be to ascribe a mans Conversion so to Free-will, as that it would be grosly prejudicial to the Grace of God, *pag.* 45. 58. Cannot any one see, that this Concession was unwary, and that he would presently have faln into this guilt, had he answered without *Tergiversation* these Questions? *viz.* Whether God did any more in order to the working in such a man this Malleableness of heart, and willingness to obey, than by giving him that ability to be wrought on by the Gospel into this good Temper, which ability he also gave equally to others, that were not so wrought on? And whether Free-will then, here, did not

not ſo cauſe the difference, as to be prejudicial to the Grace of God? And why it would be more prejudicial to the Grace of God, to aſcribe mans Converſion to Free-will, and the goodneſs of a mans Temper; than to aſcribe mans being made (to uſe his own words) Malleable, and willing to obey God, to mans Free-will, and the goodneſs of a mans Temper? Or if he will aſcribe this Malleableneſs and willingneſs to obey, to another Malleableneſs and willingneſs to obey; and that to another Malleableneſs and willingneſs to obey, and ſo forward; why he may not as well candidly aſcribe the firſt named Malleableneſs, to Free-will, as the laſt? For ſince to aſcribe any ſuch effect to a ſpecial Favour and Work of God, is the great thing oppoſed, the making the difference muſt be aſcribed to Free-will at laſt, or to Chance, or to Nothing.

Yet the Doctor ſaith; "That it is a "poſing Queſtion to him to anſwer, "What exception can poſſibly be ſtated "againſt this his Scheme, and that he "aſcribes nothing to man himſelf, but "all the good a man doth to Supernatural "Grace.

"Grace. Yea, he would ſeem, *pag.* 52, 53, 56. with high words (though of low Import) to out-go his Lordſhip, in extolling Grace, charging him as over cautious in ſaying, ["That in the Con-"verſion of a ſinner, though Free-"will co-operate, yet the Grace of "God had the main ſtroke and chiefeſt "operation."] And would have it rather ſaid, (and ſaith, all the Remonſtants herein, concur with him) "That "the Grace of God in Lapſed man, is "the one ſole principle of Converſion, "Regeneration, Repentance, and e-"very other Evangelical Virtue; and "all that can juſtly be attributed to our "will in any of theſe, is the obeying the "Motions, and making uſe of the Po-"wers, which are beſtowed upon us "by that Supernatural principle. For "(ſaith he) God's Spirit giveth us the "power, which all the good we do is "imputable to; And when we read of "God's working in us to will, and to "do; the meaning is, he giveth us "power to will, and do. But if this be the Opinion of the Doctor, and all the Remonſtrants, as he ſaith here, at leaſt

leaſt Implicitly; it is, *viz.* That obeying the Motions, and making uſe of the Powers, which God beſtoweth upon men, may juſtly be attributed to the Will, ſo, as not to any ſpecial operation of the Spirit, he only giving us the Power, and wholly leaving it to men to make uſe of it, without doing any more by his Spirit, to cauſe us to make uſe of it; I ſhall ſay, *Sit anima mea cum contra-Remonſtrantibus*, in this particular. Though ſtill I grant, that in a ſenſe, though in a very remote ſenſe; he that giveth the Tallent or Power, may be ſaid to be the cauſe of the Improvement of it, though yet in no other ſenſe, than by giving the Tallent or Power. But why then do any pray God, to cauſe them by his Spirit, to improve their Tallent, and make uſe of their power, if he do no more than meerly give the Tallent or Power, which he doth to all?

But if this be the Import of all theſe great words, as apparently it is, concerning Grace, and Supernatural-grace, given to all that enjoy the Goſpel, *viz.* That Supernatural-grace giveth them the

the very Power of Free-will, or that Power (call it what you will) without which, men could not be Inexcuſable in not obeying the Goſpel; and God goeth no further by his Spirit with any in order to their Converſion; and this Power doth all in Converſion, and in cauſing the difference; therefore Supernatural-grace doth all good, and nothing is Imputable to the man in the whole work: I ſay, if this be the meaning, it is an empty ſound, and exalts Gods ſpecial Grace and Kindneſs no more in, and oblidges a man no more to, ſpecial Thankfulneſs for, the work of this Converſion; than if it was ſaid, God by his Supernatural-grace made us Men, endued us with Underſtanding and Will; And man doth all in Improving the Goſpel to his own Converſion, therefore God doth all: Or, God by his common Providence, cauſeth men to have Free-will, and Free-will doth all, therefore God doth all. Neither doth it denote any more any more or leſs of Kindneſs in God, or engage men any more or leſs to Thankfulneſs, to ſay, God by his ordinary

Pro-

Providence gave Free-will, or the Power (be it what it will) without which he could not be Inexcuſable, in not obeying the Goſpel; than to ſay, God by his Supernatural-grace, gave Free-will, or the Power aforeſaid; while it is only Free-will, or the Power without which men could not ſin in not obeying the Goſpel, that is ſaid to be given either way. Neither would it any more or leſs hinder a man's boaſting, That although he received the Power from God as others did, yet, that he differs from them, or made good uſe of the Power, he owes to himſelf and Free-will. Neither would this be a Diſpute of any Importance in Divinity to be determined, whether Supernatural-grace cauſed this Power, or common Providence (though it would be a groſs Impropriety to ſay, Men could not ſin without Supernatural-grace.) Yea, it is all one, as to Religious Concerns, whether you call this Power, the Remote and Fundamental Power (to uſe the words of the Doctor and others) or the *Proximate* power of Free-will, while there is meant by

by it only that Power, without which, men that enjoy the Gospel could not sin; or which is all one, be Inexcusable in not obeying it, and which is given to all that enjoy the Gospel.

Now it is so apparent, that it is a wonder that any should have the understanding of men, and not acknowledg it; That Grace actively taken for God's Act, or passively for the effect of this Act, in mens Conversion, lieth not in God's causing, or mans receiving the very Power or Faculty of Free-will; or the Power without which men could not culpably sin, or be inexcusable in not obeying the Gospel; but it lieth in Gods doing or giving, and mans receiving some thing from him, that man hath the ability to chuse the Good and refuse the Evil, or to Obey or Disobey the Gospel without; else a man could not pray for Grace for himself or others, to keep them from sinning against, or disobeying the Gospel, if they had no ability to do so without it. It lieth in God's giving, and mens receiving something, that God is not bound in Justice to give, or to hold men

men excuſable for not obeying the Goſpel; or, which is the ſame, it lieth not in giving that, which if he gave not, he could not in Juſtice condemn men for not obeying the Goſpel: Whereas God is bound in Juſtice to give the Natural Power or Faculty of obeying the Goſpel, or he could not in Juſtice condemn men for not obeying of it; becauſe in ſuch caſes, they would be wholly excuſable from ſuch Obedience, as Infants, and Idiots are. And therefore the Power, without which men would be excuſable, being an effect of Juſtice, is not to be accounted as the Doctor calls it, an effect of Supernatural-grace, nor of Grace or Favour, or Kindneſs at all: Do not miſtake me, I mean only; It is not of favour or kindneſs to give this Power, or not condemn men for not doing what they had not this Power, which makes inexcuſable, to do: For I know, it is a Favour and Kindneſs, and a great one too, to give men ability to chuſe the Good, and refuſe the Evil; becauſe, without it, they would not have the very Natural power of obtaining the



Promiſed great good Things; and he might juſtly deprive all men of this Power, as he doth ſome, even natural Fools; provided that when he doth ſo, he doth not require them to chuſe the Good, and refuſe the Evil: But yet upon Suppoſition, that he will require them to chuſe the Good and refuſe the Evil, it is neceſſary in juſtice, that he give them ſo much ability, to chuſe the Good and refuſe the Evil, as may make them Inexcuſable in not doing it; and only ſo much as he doth for them more than this, in order to the overcoming their wickedneſs, and Averſation to Good, and cauſing them to chuſe the Good and refuſe the Evil, is of Grace, and Favour, and Kindneſs; being more than is due in Juſtice to be done, to free them from Condemnation for the not doing it: All which, is *Diametrically* oppoſite to the Doctor's Notion of Grace, who maintains the juſt contrary.

I am ſenſible, I may be thought to have let my Pen ramble here too far, in oppoſing theſe Letters of the Doctors; but I was Induced to it by ſuch Reaſons as theſe. *Firſt,*

Firſt, Becauſe, though it will be apparent to any Intelligent conſidering man that reads this Author's Book, that he hath the ſame common Notions with Doctor *Hammond*, about Grace; yet they lie more remote from vulgar Apprehenſions; he ſpeaking ſo little *ex profeſſo*, to declare what he means by it.

Secondly, Becauſe I look upon this Opinion, maintained in the ſaid Letters, as deſtructive to all true Piety, if Practically held; for no man that holds ſuch Principles, can ſeriouſly with his Heart, pray or praiſe God for the Converſion or Sanctification of himſelf or others (as I have ſhewed Irrefragably elſe-where) not ſo much as in the words of the Common-Prayer. If any doubt of this, let them but take the Book and read ſuch Prayers, and ſee if they can think the meaning of ſuch Prayers, is, that God would give them and others, only that Power to obey, which he is bound in Juſtice to give them, whether they pray or pray not for it, or could not condemn them for not obeying, as is apparent of that

Power without which men would be excuſable.

Thirdly, Becauſe thoſe Letters are commonly pretended to be Unanſwerable, and they that are not competent Judges, may have this probable account to think ſo, becauſe there is no Evidence (that I know of) of any Reply made by his Lordſhip, nor Intimation of his being unſatisfied with them, when as Doctor *Hammond* highly pretends his Lordſhips concurrence with him. For my part, though I ſhould judg that his Lordſhip (having as himſelf confeſſeth, not much ſtudied ſuch things) had not very cleer Notions about theſe Controverſies, if his words be ſet down to the beſt Advantage by Doctor *Hammond*; as appears by his granting, that the effect of the Grace of the Holy Spirit is ſomething, that if denied to men they would be excuſable. Yet, I think it almoſt as eaſie a matter to Vindicate what he ſaith in the Main, in the important Points of ſpecial Grace, and unconditionate Decrees, againſt Doctor *Hammonds* Exceptions, as to Write ſo much Paper.

And

And I cannot but highly commend to conſideration, that ſober Sentiment of his Lordſhip, who confeſſing his own Diſability, to reconcile the conſiſtency of Grace, and Free-will in Converſion; and being ſenſible they muſt both be maintained, tells us: "He ever "held, and ſtill doth hold it the more "pious and ſafe way, to place the Grace "of God in the Throne where we "think it ſhould ſtand, and ſo to leave "the Will of Man to ſhift, for the "maintenance of its own Freedom, as "well as it can; than to eſtabliſh the "Power and Liberty of Free-will at "the heighth, and then to be at a Loſs "how to maintain the Power and Effi-"cacy of Gods Grace. Though Doctor *Hammond* expreſſeth his diſlike of this Saying, and that he thinks it no great difficulty to Reconcile them; but that this way of his doth it ſatisfactorily, and is eaſie of Conception, (and it is indeed too eaſie of all conſcience to be the truth.) The Reſult whereof is, that God by his Spirit and Grace, giveth only the Power, without which men enjoying the Goſpel would not be

Inexcuſable, which is indeed no other than the proper Natural power of Free-will, whatever can be pretended to the contrary: And though he hath ſome Expreſſions that one unwary, or not verſed in ſuch things, would think ſounded ſomething more, as Grace, being operative and moving; yet it is apparent, he means, it no otherways moves, than by giving this Power of not reſiſting the Goſpel, without which men enjoying the Goſpel, would be excuſable in not obeying it, which is given to all; and to ſay otherwiſe, would be to overthrow his whole Fabrick, as will fully appear to any one that will but read conſiderately, and ſuppoſe thoſe Queſtions put concerning any ſuch Dubious words, which I have put, *pag.* 65, 66, 67, 68. of my Diſcourſe of *Natural and Moral Impotency*, to force the Explaining of ſuch words; and alſo conſider what would be anſwered to them.

I judg that one great cauſe of Doctor *Hammond*'s miſtakes under debate, as well as of this Author's, was chiefly their want of diſtinct Notions about Natu-

Natural and Moral Impotency, as appears by their affirming, as both of them do, and the Doctor particularly, *pag.* 86. that, It is a direct contradiction to hold a Power in one sense, and a want of Power in another sense, to the same Act; to hold, That a man hath a Moral impotency, to do what he hath a Natural power to do: And consequently, also his not distinguishing between Natural and Moral Irresistibility. It is also apparent, that another great cause of his mistakes, is, his forgetting, or not considering that men are Universally wicked; else he would not suppose it Irrational to hold, (as he doth *pag.* 36. and 38.) that no one man that had power enough to obey the Gospel, sufficient to render him Inexcusable in not obeying it, (as I think all have that have the Gospel, and are not Natural Fools) did ever obey the Gospel, without the addition of some further Supereffluence of Grace, to make him Willing of Unwilling. Now if this be not to forget, or deny that all men are wicked, so wicked that their Enmity and Aversation of will to Good, will

never be overcome but by the Grace of the Holy Ghost; I know not what is. And I grant, that except men were Universally wicked, it would be Irrational to suppose that of such Multitudes, none should obey without such Grace.

But I think, I have said enough in my Discourse of *Natural and Moral Impotency*, to shew the Danger, and Inconsistency of such Opinions, as these Letters of the Doctor's are written to maintain; (though I living obscurely, had not seen those Letters when I wrote that Discourse.) And if yet any intelligent man shall satisfie me, that I have not said enough there to this end, or that there is any thing said in those Letters, that needeth a more particular answer, I may probably say more: For my great Aversation to such Principles, will much encline me upon an easie call to oppose the Prevalency of them, till I shall see some fitter man of our own Church and Language, where they prevail (as I doubt not but there are many, whose Abilities and Circumstances make them far more fit) willing to undertake it, and save the Labour of my weak Endeavours.

But

But now to attend the Author after this large Digreſſion, who ſtill goes on to give the meaning of *Rom.* 4.

"The Apoſtle alſo in this his Argu-
"mentation, conſidereth the former ſtate
"and condition of the Perſon, *viz.*
"of *Abraham*, to whom this Faith was
"imputed for Righteouſneſs. He was
"ungodly, and guilty of grievous ſins,
"and therefore the Apoſtle ſaith Em-
"phatically, that *Abraham* believed in
"him who juſtifieth one ungodly: By
"that, implying that *Abraham* before
"the Divine vocation, was ſo far from
"deſerving any thing from God by
"any good Works, that on the contra-
"ry, he was guilty of the greateſt
"ſins; So that the Mercy of God
"was wonderful, both that he had re-
"vealed himſelf in ſo ſingular a way to
"ſo great a ſinner, and had called him
"to his Service: And alſo, that he not
"only bleſſed with the Pardon of his
"great ſins, but alſo rewarded with
"the greateſt Rewards, *Abraham* be-
"lieving him, revealing himſelf to
"him. But you will ſay, What was
"this Impiety of *Abraham* before he

"was

"was called? I answer, Idolatry, the "greatest of Impieties, as the Scrip- "ture it self plainly testifies, *Josh.* "24. 2, 3. *&c.* where God saith in "the plural Number, *That the Fathers "of the* Hebrews *served other Gods:* "And he expresses whom he means, "[*Thareh*, the Father of *Abraham*, "and the Father of *Nachor*,] so that "he puts those three, the Father with "the Children, in the same Predica- "ment. Also, after he had said [*they "served other gods*,] he adds, [*And "he took your Father* Abraham,] *ver.*3. "evidently denoting, that this is com- "memorated amongst the kindnesses "to the *Israelites*, that when their "Ancestors, *viz.* the Grand-Father "of *Israel*, both by his Father and Mo- "ther, *Abraham* and *Nahor*, living "with their Father in *Chaldea*, wor- "shipped other gods; God of his meer "Mercy, without any merit of his, "took *Abraham*, and gave to him a "Heir, and an Inheritance: Also the "Apostle seems in these words [*of ju- "stifying the ungodly*,] by a tacit in- "deed, but yet by a strong Argument,

"to

"to check the Arrogancy of the *Jews*,
"who did abhor the Sinful and I-
"dolatrous *Gentiles*, *Gal.*2.15. though
"Converted to the true God, by Faith
"in Christ, and Repentance, and new
"Obedience; And would by no means
"admit them to the favour of Justifica-
"tion, unless approved by a long and
"continued working, or at least purg'd
"by Circumcision and Sacrifices. For
"the Apostle shews in these words,
"that *Abraham* their Father (and so
"they in him) was called in the same
"manner from Idolatry, and the wor-
"ship of false Gods: And was, imme-
"diately after his belief of the Pro-
"mises, and Obedience given to the
"Divine vocation (yea before he was
"Circumcised, as is a little-after shew-
"ed) accepted of God. Who would
"not here admire the divine wit of
"the Apostle! Furthermore, this be-
"longs to all Justified, since there is
"none that is not guilty of hainous sins
"before Grace received,& so who doth
"not need Pardon, and Divine Remis-
"sion. Which the Apostle well proves
"by a Testimony out of *David*, *ver.*
6, 7, 8.

"6, 7, 8. And afterward the Apoſtle "paſſes to the Controverſie concerning "Circumciſion, *ver.* 9.

The Author here indeed giveth the true ſenſe of many *verſes* in this *Chapter*, *Rom.* 4. But the fault is, he faineth the Apoſtle to bring them in Deſultorily, or as Ropes of Sand without any coherence; as when he ſaith, [The Apoſtle alſo conſidereth the former ſtate of *Abraham*,] whereas the Apoſtle in this Chapter, brings it in Argumentatively; and, had the Author given a right Interpretation of the Verſes before, he might readily have ſeen how this of *Abrahams* being ungodly, comes in moſt rationally to prove, that *Abraham* was not Juſtified by Works, but by Righteouſneſs Imputed to him, and that his Juſtification was of Grace, and not of Debt. So, whereas he tells us, that [the Apoſtle doth afterward, *viz. verſe* 9. paſs to the controverſie of Circumciſion] there is no paſſing to a new Controverſie; but the Apoſtle there draweth an Argument from that, that *Abraham* was Juſtified upon his Believing and Obeying God before he

was

was Circumciſed; to prove that *Abraham* was not Juſtified by Works, in the ſenſe wherein he oppoſes his Juſtification by Works, as I have elſe-where made apparent.

Now he comes to give us the Reſult of his thoughts, how his ſenſe of this Chapter, tends to Reconcile the two Apoſtles.

"Hence there cleerly ſhines forth "an Agreement between *James* and "*Paul*, when from the ſame Example "of *Abraham*, one concludes that a "man is Juſtified without Works, the "other by Works, *viz.* *Paul* conſi- "ders *Abraham* according to the Fleſh; "ſuch as he was before his calling; but "*James* conſiders him as now being "already favoured with Grace and "Divine Vocation. One denies his "Juſtification by works done before "Faith; the other aſcribes his Juſtifi- "cation to his works proceeding from "Faith. And ſo, there is no contra- "diction here between the Apo- "ſtles.

This is (if I may borrow a phraſe from *Celſus*) like caſting Lots what to ſay, to

* *Referente Origene*, lib. 6.

to Reconcile the Apoſtles. And this is the common Evaſion of the *Papiſts*, when an Argument is brought againſt them from ſuch paſſages in *Pauls* Epiſtles, to prove that no man is Juſtified by the Merit of Works, or perfect Obedience.

Further, It is notoriouſly falſe, that *Paul* here conſiders *Abraham* as he was before the Divine calling, and his believing. For,

Firſt, He ſpeaks expreſly of him as believing, and having ſuch a ſtrong Faith as overcame great Oppoſitions; and of his being Juſtified by ſuch Faith.

Secondly, He proves, that when he Believed and Obeyed, he was not Juſtified by Works, in the ſenſe wherein he excludes his Juſtification by Works, *viz.* by perfect Obedience, or Jewiſh Obſervations, or Meritorious Works.

Thirdly, He as equally excludes Works done after Faith, as before, *viz.* ſuch works as he excludes.

Fourthly, The Apoſtle brings this Circumſtance, to prove he was not Juſtified

ſtified by Works, *viz.* That he was Juſtified before Circumciſion, *ver.* 16. which he could not have done, had he in ſpeaking of him conſidered him as he was before the Divine Call, ſo as to deny his Juſtification by works done before it. For had this been his meaning to deny his Juſtification, only by ſuch works done in his eſtate of Heatheniſm; it would rather have furthered this denial, and have added force to it by way of Argument, could he have ſhewed that *Abraham*'s Juſtification was not till after his Circumciſion, and Receiving the Seal of the Covenant.

Fifthly, The *Phariſaical-Jews* which the Apoſtle there oppoſeth, would not, be ſure, pretend that *Abraham* was Juſtified while he lived in Heatheniſh courſes, before the Divine Call, that the Apoſtle ſhould need to oppoſe it. Yea, it was their Intereſt, if they would maintain their firſt Opinion, of Excluding the Uncircumciſed *Gentiles* from Salvation and Juſtification, to Plead (though falſe) that *Abraham* was not Juſtified, till Circum-

cumciſed; or, (which is true) that he was not Juſtified while he lived in Heatheniſh courſes, as they might pretend (though falſly) the Uncircumciſed Converted *Gentiles* did. But for the true meaning of this whole Chapter, ſince I would not needleſly repeat the ſame thing: See my ſhort Diſcourſe of the Apoſtle *Paul*'s meaning.

Thus I have ſet before you all conſiderable, that our Author ſaith concerning the only two Arguments, that he tells us, the Apoſtle *Paul* maketh uſe of, againſt Juſtification by the Law, and Works, that concern the whole Body of the *Moſaic-Law*, containing in it (as he ſaith) the Moral-Law. He next proceeds, *viz. Chap.* 14. to tell us how the Apoſtle oppoſeth the Ritual, and Ceremonial-Law, but he ſpends but few Lines about it; ſaying, there is no diſpute about that among Chriſtians.

Chapter 15. is ſpent in Citing out of ſome Authors, ſome ſayings of the *Jews*, in Defence of the Power of Free-will, without the Grace of the Spirit, which he ſpeaks againſt, though many

many of them may be capable of no ill Conſtruction; poſſibly meaning no more, than that men have the natural Power of Free-will (without which they cannot be men, or guilty of ſin) from common Providence: And not that the Will is not Morally inſuperably wicked without Grace.

Chapter 16. He well ſhews out of Jewiſh Authors, that it was a common errour amongſt them, to think they perfectly obeyed the Law, and did all it required; if they didbut ſome few External things, thinking thoſe Precepts that required Inward-Holineſs, and Heart-Obedience, were only Counſel, and not Commands; and ſo, in ſtead of bringing up their Lives to the Law, they maintained ſuch Opinions as brought the Law down to their Lives; as, that it required no more than an External partial Obedience.

But I cannot but wonder at his Corollary which he draws hence, and makes uſe of as an Argument againſt others; which is this: *Pag.* 318. "Hence it is manifeſt, that they do

"widely Err from the Scope of the "Apoſtle, that hold that he diſputes "againſt perfect Obedience to the "Law, as a defended and received "Opinion amongſt the *Jews*; for it "is manifeſt out of what I have ſaid, "that they were ſo far from this per-"ſwaſion, that they were content to "ſtand ſtill within the bounds of too "Imperfect Obedience.

Is this Author ſerious? Let me ask a few Queſtions ſeriouſly. Whether is it more likely, that this Author ſhould maintain Perfection in this Life, and that a man may be Juſtified by the Law, without the Goſpel, and Pardon; that holds there is not any Law of God, that requires more than Chriſtians that are ſincere, ordinarily perform? Or he that holds, that God is ſo Holy, and his Law ſo Exact, that though he believes God will accept his weak Endeavours, yet thinks, he falls ſhort every day in many things, ſo as to need Pardon, and the Blood of Chriſt for ſuch failings?

Whe-

Whether is a Proteſtant that holds he falls ſhort of his Duty in every thing; or a *Papiſt*, that holds that God's Law requires ſo little, that he can ſuper-erogate, and do more than God requires, likelier to hold Perfection?

Whether is a man that holds, that God's Law requires him to Love and Serve God with all his Heart, and Soul, and Strength, likelier to hold Perfection in this Life, or a man that holds, that Luke-warmneſs is no ſin? As a great Doctor * doth in theſe words: "There is but "one thing in the world "that God hates beſide "Sin, and that is Indifferency, and "Luke-warmneſs, which although it "hath not in it the direct Nature of "Sin, yet it hath this Teſtimony "from God, that it is Loathſome and "Abominable; And excepting this "thing alone, God never ſaid ſo of "any thing in the New-Teſtament, "but what was a direct Breach of a "Commandment.

* Doctor *Taylors Rel. of Prayer, Serm.* 5. *pag.* 46.

This Author takes much pains (*pag.* 327. *&c.*) to prove, that the Church of *England* in the Eleventh Article of Religion, by these words, *viz.* [We are accounted Righteous before God, only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, That we are Justified by Faith only, is a most wholsome Doctrine, and very full of Comfort.] I say, by these words, doth not attribute any Efficacy or Dignity to Faith, more than to other Virtues, in the business of Justification. Now, I dislike not this attempt at all, and so shall say nothing here.

To conclude, The Reader may hence see how Improbable that is, which he tells us in his Epistle Dedicatory to the Reverend Lord Bishop of *Glocester*; saying. "He did nothing in putting "out this Book, but having first con- "sulted him, and that it was put out "with his Aid or Assistance (*auspiciis*.) "And that the Bishop read deliberate-

"ly

"ly every Chapter of either Diſſerta-
"tion, and approved them with his
"Vote, and adorned them with his
"Praiſes.

Some of this Book is indeed commendable; and his Lordſhip, might commend that; But it may be obſerved, that we have only this Author's word, for this over-high Commendation of his Book, and every part of it; Who alſo cannot but be ſuſpected, to have had great Temptation to pretend it, to gain Repute to his Opinion, by ſo great a Name of ſo Reverend a Prelate, and Learned a Writer.

FINIS.